HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLIII JANUARY, 1950 NUMBER 1

THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS

CHARLES H. BUCK, JR.
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

RECENTLY it has been pointed out afresh that in any investigation into Paul's life the Pauline letters must be taken as the primary source while Acts must be treated as of secondary rank.[1] For although Luke may have been an eyewitness to some of the events which he narrates, his knowledge of most of the happenings in his book was derived either from the recollections of others or from written sources,[2] and when historical information is transmitted in this way through several hands the possibility of misunderstanding and inaccuracy is greatly enlarged.

Such a distinction between primary and secondary sources is so obvious as to amount to an axiom of historical study. It is mentioned in this connection only because in the study of Paul's life it has failed to be applied consistently. Historians have often looked on Acts as Paul's biography and considered the autobiographical information of the letters as so much extra information to be inserted at convenient points in the framework of Acts. At many points, where the evidence of the letters agrees with Acts to begin with, this process of harmonization yields satisfactory results. At other points, however, the information of Acts and the letters is so contradictory that the two sources can be harmonized only by resorting to a most complicated and unnatural exegesis. In far too many cases a critical presumption in favor of Acts has relegated the letters to the position of a secondary source, to be followed when they agree with Acts and explained away when they disagree. That this method belies the

[1] J. Knox, "'Fourteen Years Later:' A Note on the Pauline Chronology," Journal of Religion, XVI (1936), 341–49; "The Pauline Chronology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 15–29; D. W. Riddle, Paul, Man of Conflict (Nashville, 1940); P. S. Minear, "The Jerusalem Fund and Pauline Chronology," Anglican Theological Review, XXV (1943), 389–96.

[2] H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (New York, 1927).

canons of sound practice in historical research needs no demonstration. That it has failed to give satisfactory solutions to any of the main problems in the life of Paul is evident to every serious student of the New Testament.

The letters do not, for the most part, deal with Paul's activities at the time of writing. Four letters, however, mention the collection for the saints, the offering which Paul gathered among his churches for the relief of the poor in the Jerusalem community. These four, Romans, I and II Corinthians, and Galatians, were written while the collection was in progress and disclose such an unusual amount of information about Paul's activities at the time that one can reconstruct on the basis of their evidence alone a fairly continuous account of the events of the period.

I

Paul wrote I Corinthians to a church of which he himself had been the founder some time previously.[3] At the time of writing he was in Ephesus and his instructions for the gathering of the collection in Corinth before his arrival there were given as follows: "Concerning the collection for the saints, as I instructed the churches of Galatia, so you are to do also. On the first day of every week each one of you is to lay aside at home whatever he can afford, so that there may not be collections when I come. And when I arrive I will send those whom you approve by letters to carry your gift to Jerusalem. If it is necessary for me to go also, they will go with me. I will come to you after I have gone through Macedonia, for I am going through Macedonia, and it may be that I will stay with you or even pass the winter, so that you may send me on to wherever I am going. For I do not want to see you now in passing, for I hope to spend some time with you, if the Lord allows. I stay in Ephesus until Pentecost, for a wide and effective door has opened to me and the adversaries are many. If Timothy comes, see to it that he is without fear among you, for he is doing the work of the Lord, as I am. Therefore let no one despise him. Send him on in peace, that he may come to me,

[3] I Cor. iii. 6: "I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." Cf. II Cor. x. 14: "We were the first to come as far as you in the gospel of Christ."

for I expect him with the brethren" (I Cor. xvi. 1–11). Strictly speaking, the line, "I stay in Ephesus until Pentecost," might have been written any time within the year previous to the Pentecost mentioned. When Paul speaks of his half-formed plan of spending the winter in Corinth, however, it is natural to assume that he means the winter immediately succeeding and not two winters hence. Therefore it seems safe to conclude that the letter was written in the early spring.

His plans were clear. After leaving Ephesus he would make his way to Corinth via Macedonia. Before setting out, however, he expected the return of Timothy and the brethren, who had already started over this route ahead of Paul, presumably to prepare for the gathering of the collection.[4] Paul's plans for the more remote future were less definite. He was not certain whether he himself would go with the money to Jerusalem or remain in the west. His mention of the possibility of his staying in Corinth over the winter may be taken as evidence that he expected the collection to be finished by late summer and the money to be sent by ship on the first leg of its trip to Jerusalem before the seas were closed to navigation by reason of the bad weather.[5]

When we turn to II Corinthians for the continuation of the story of the collection the situation is more complex. Most critics favor partition of the text into at least two fragments and some are convinced that many separate pieces have gone to make up the present thirteen chapters of the work.[6] The most generally accepted of these theories is that which divides the text at the end of ch. ix and looks on chs. x–xiii as part of a letter of Paul written to Corinth on a different occasion from that of the writing of the rest of the letter. The reasons for assuming a break at this

[4] The "previous letter" (mentioned in I Cor. v. 9 ff.) probably contained the first information about the collection and the mission of Timothy. It is abundantly clear that the Corinthians knew of the collection before they received I Corinthians, for that letter refers to the collection as a project already familiar to its readers.

[5] It has been suggested that I Corinthians may not be a single letter (J. Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity (New York, 1937), I, pp. 323–41). The various theories of partition, however, do not affect the evidence given above, since there is no reason for suspecting the integrity of ch. xvi, which deals with the collection.

[6] The evidence for and against the various partition theories of II Corinthians is presented conveniently by P. W. Schmiedel in Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, II (Freiburg und Leipzig, 1893), pp. 74–90, 252–256, 267–270. Cf. also K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul (London, 1911), pp. 154 ff.

point are obvious. Whereas the first nine chapters are among Paul's most serene and gentle writing, filled with expressions of joy at the renewed loyalty of the Corinthians, the last four chapters adopt a severity of tone and a sharpness of expression which is all the more marked by reason of the contrast with what has gone just before. So noticeable and abrupt is this change that it seems incredible that Paul could have followed the affectionate outpouring of the first nine chapters with the angered and threatening words of the last four. This change of tone, which has always been the fundamental reason for dividing the letter, must ever remain the most serious objection to the integrity of the text as we now have it.[7]

Practically all the interpreters who hold the view that chs. x–xiii are to be separated from chs. i–ix couple it with another closely related hypothesis: that these four chapters are, as a matter of fact, part of the severe letter which Paul had written to Corinth not long before the writing of II Cor. i–ix. This letter, written in "anguish and tears" (ii.4), had threatened the Corinthians with punishment at Paul's hands unless they took steps themselves toward repentance and amendment of life. It had produced the desired effect (vii.8–12). The chief offender against whom Paul had written had been denounced and, it would seem, excommunicated, for Paul now writes to urge the Corinthians to avoid excessive harshness in dealing with this person and to reaffirm their love for him (ii.5–11). It is possible that the offender in question was the incestuous man who is mentioned in I Cor. v.1, but there is no certain evidence as to his identity or the nature of his crime.

It seems reasonable to assume that Titus was the bearer of this letter, or went to Corinth soon after it was sent, for it was from Titus, when he met Paul in Macedonia (II Cor. vii.5 ff.), that Paul learned the effect of its severity.

Can the severe letter be the source of the four concluding

[7] It is probable that the section, vi.14–vii.1, is a fragment of another letter and has been copied in its present position by mistake. Arguments for the removal of either viii or ix (for which see Schmiedel, op. cit., pp. 252–256) are slender when taken separately; taken together they are hopelessly contradictory. It would seem that the solution to the problems of these two chapters lies rather in the exegesis of the text as it stands than in viewing either of them as a separate fragment.

chapters of II Corinthians? The arguments in favor of this identification, in addition to the obvious severity of those chapters, revolve about a series of correspondences which can be shown to exist between chs. i–ix and x–xiii and which seem to indicate beyond question that i–ix was written with x–xiii in mind.[8]

It was to spare you that I refrained from coming. (i.23)	If I come again I will not spare. (xiii.2)
I wrote as I did so that when I came I might not be pained by those who should have made me glad. (ii.3)	I write this while I am away from you in order that when I come I may not have to be severe. (xiii.10)
This is why I wrote, that I might test you and know whether you are obedient in everything. (ii.9)	Being ready to punish every disobedience, when your obedience is complete. (x.6)

On the strength of these correspondences the identification of x–xiii with the severe letter has gained wide acceptance. This conclusion, however, is seriously weakened, if not disposed of entirely, by the recognition of quite as convincing a set of correspondences with I Corinthians.

It was to spare you that I refrained from coming. (i.23)	Some are arrogant, as though I were not coming to you. But I will come to you soon, if the Lord wills, and I will find out not the talk of the arrogant but their power. (I Cor. iv.18 f.)
I wrote as I did so that when I came I might not be pained by those who should have made me glad. (ii.3)	What do you wish? Shall I come to you with a rod, or with love in a spirit of gentleness? (I Cor. iv.21)
This is why I wrote, that I might test you and know whether you are obedient in everything. (ii.9)	I write this not to shame you but to admonish you as my beloved children. (I Cor. iv.14)

The three lines given above from I Cor. iv might easily be considered the writing to which the three allusions in II Cor. i

[8] K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 154 ff.

and ii point. And indeed, any three lines promising a visit for the punishment of offenders but expressing at the same time the hope that such punishment might prove unnecessary would do as well. The sentiments are such commonplaces that it is difficult to see how Paul could have avoided them in writing any threatening letter.

There is reason to believe, on the other hand, that chs. x–xiii were written after i–ix. In xii.16 ff. Paul defended himself and his associates against the charge that they had practiced fraud against the Corinthians. "But granting that I myself did not burden you, I was crafty, you say, and got the better of you by guile. Did I take advantage of you through any of those whom I sent to you? I urged Titus to go and sent the brother with him. Did Titus take advantage of you? Did we not act in the same spirit? Did we not take the same steps?" On the assumption that x–xiii are part of the severe letter this passage can only mean that Titus had been in Corinth on some former occasion, had been accused subsequently of taking advantage of the church, had returned to Corinth with this very letter which defends him against his accusers, had then returned to Paul in Macedonia with a favorable report of conditions in Corinth, and had from there gone a third time to Corinth as the bearer of II Cor. i–ix. In other words, when Titus returned to Paul in Macedonia he was coming from his second visit to Corinth. But the obvious inference to be drawn from II Cor. vii.13 ff., written at the time of this meeting in Macedonia, is that Titus was returning from his first visit to Corinth and not from his second. The passage reads as follows: "In addition to our own comfort we rejoiced even more exceedingly at the joy of Titus, because his spirit has been refreshed by all of you. For if I have boasted to him a bit about you, I was not put to shame, but just as we told the truth to you in every respect, so our boasting to Titus turned out to be true." What can this mean except that before Titus's visit to Corinth he had known the Corinthians only through Paul's glowing reports of them and that what he had formerly known only as hearsay he was now in a position to verify from actual experience? It is true that the passage does not say explicitly that Titus had never been in Corinth before and in the absence of such a denial one might be

tempted to assume an earlier visit on which Titus had not stayed long enough to learn anything about the Corinthians at first hand. But such a visit is definitely excluded by xii.16 ff., according to which Titus had stayed long enough to engage in activities which might later be denounced as fraudulent. A more natural interpretation of the references to Titus is that Titus went to Corinth for the first time as the bearer of the severe letter, returned to Paul in Macedonia, and then went back immediately to Corinth on his second visit, this time taking with him II Cor. i–ix. At some later time Paul found himself being accused of having defrauded the Corinthians through the agency of Titus and wrote the defense of which x–xiii is a part.

There is still further evidence that II Cor. x–xiii is not to be identified with the severe letter. The opponents against whom the latter chapters are directed are not the same as the offender whose punishment is alluded to in i–ix. This latter person was a member of the Corinthian church whose offense was punished by a majority action of the members of that church. "But if anyone has caused pain, he has caused it not to me, but in some measure — not to put it too severely — to you all. For such a one this punishment by the majority is enough; so you should rather turn to forgive and comfort him, or he may be overwhelmed by excessive sorrow. So I beg you to reaffirm your love for him." (ii.5 ff.) According to this passage it seems clear that the punishment, whatever else it may have entailed, involved excommunication, a measure which Paul thinks so severe as to call for mitigation lest it result in despair.

When we turn to x–xiii, however, the situation there described is quite different. In those chapters Paul is dealing with several opponents. They are not members of the Corinthian church but have come into it from outside, claiming authority to preach a different gospel from that which Paul had preached.[9] They are interlopers, the most natural identification of whom is that they were Jewish missionaries who had come to Corinth in Paul's absence, had given themselves out as apostles whose authority was superior to Paul's, had preached a different gospel from that which Paul had preached, and unlike Paul had demanded support

[9] II Cor. xi.2 ff.

from the Corinthian church.[10] When informed by the Corinthians that Paul had never taken money from them, these men had apparently given two replies. They had said that Paul's refusal to receive support as the other apostles did was evidence that Paul was not a true apostle. They had also suggested that although Paul himself may not have taken money directly, he had taken advantage of the Corinthians by means of his agents. Chs. x–xiii are an impassioned denial of these charges on Paul's part and an equally impassioned assertion of the authenticity of his apostleship. There is no hint in these chapters of the situation to which the severe letter was apparently written and there is no trace of these opponents, on the other hand, in chs. i–ix, which record Paul's joy at the restoration of peace and order in Corinth. In fact, detailed examination of the two sections of the letter fails to disclose a single correspondence with regard to the background against which these sections were written.

This evidence would seem to indicate that the identification of II Cor. x–xii with the severe letter must be abandoned. Moreover, if these chapters were not part of the severe letter a direct and simple reconstruction of the events is possible. Shortly after writing I Corinthians Paul learned that the letter had not had its desired effect and that nothing short of his own presence was required at Corinth. The evidence of this "intermediate visit" to Corinth, as it is usually called, is found in II Cor. i.23 and ii.1: "But I call God to witness against me — it was to spare you that I did not come back to Corinth . . . For I made up my mind not to make you another painful visit." These lines most naturally mean that Paul had paid a recent visit to Corinth that had ended painfully. Rather than risk a repetition of this unpleasantness he had decided against returning to Corinth, although he was expected back. Such an interpretation of the lines makes clear the meaning of the verses just preceding, in which Paul writes: "I wanted to visit you on my way to Macedonia and to come back to you from Macedonia and have you send me on my way to Judea" (i.16). It now becomes clear, however, that before carrying out this plan Paul had sent Titus to Corinth to prepare the way for the promised return. Meanwhile Paul met with hostility in Asia and

[10] II Cor. x.13 ff.; xi.7 ff.; xi.21 ff.

probably because of the danger there went to Troas, where he hoped he might meet Titus returning from Corinth (ii.12 f.). From this it is apparent that Paul knew Titus's expected route from Corinth and was really delaying his own departure for that city until he should have had from Titus a report of conditions there. But Titus was not in Troas, so Paul crossed to Macedonia, hoping to find him there.

Paul's meeting with Titus in Macedonia was the occasion for the writing of II Cor. i–ix. In that letter he expressed his joy that the Corinthians had settled their disputes and had received Titus in a right spirit. He also explained why he had not come to them as he had intended: he had hesitated in the first instance because he feared the visit would turn out badly, and now found himself so taken up with the Macedonian collection that he could not leave. But since Titus, and the unnamed brother who had accompanied him, had already made a beginning of the work of the collection in Corinth, Paul decided to send them back to carry on. With them he was sending a third man, a representative of the churches, who had been appointed to travel with him and assist in the collection (vii.16–24).[11] Titus's first mission to Corinth had been an unqualified success and there is not the slightest trace in II Cor. i–ix of any hesitancy on Paul's part with regard to the good feelings which existed between Titus and the Corinthian church.

Recognition of the fact that II Cor. x–xiii must have been written after these events had taken place rather than before them can only mean that Paul's hope of an easy settlement of the Corinthian difficulties was ill-founded and that Titus was not successful in completing the work which he seemed to have begun so auspiciously. It also means that the evidence usually found in the Corinthian correspondence of an ultimate reconciliation between Paul and his Corinthian opponents has vanished. If the letters are read in this order, relations between Paul and Corinth are seen to have been steadily worsening during the whole period of the collection. The evidence stops at a time when these rela-

[11] This man was not Paul's personal representative but was someone appointed by the churches. Accordingly he is not mentioned in xii.18, where at a later time Paul defends only Titus and the brother (the two who were his own representatives) against the charge of fraud.

tions are little short of the breaking point. Corinth is on the way to becoming a second Galatia.[12]

The story of the collection trip is resumed in the letter to the Romans. "At present, however, I am going to Jerusalem with aid for the saints. For Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased to make some contribution for the poor among the saints at Jerusalem. They were pleased to do it, and indeed they are in debt to them, for if the Gentiles have come to share in their spiritual blessings, they ought also to be of service to them in material blessings. When, therefore, I have completed this and have delivered to them what has been raised, I shall go on by way of you to Spain; and I know that when I come to you I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ. I appeal to you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the spirit, to strive together with me in your prayers to God on my behalf, that I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea, and that my service for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints, so that by God's will I may come to you with joy and be refreshed in your company" (xv.25 ff.). This passage is usually interpreted to mean that Paul had finished his work in Macedonia and had moved to Corinth, where he had received the Corinthian collection according to plan. But there is nothing in the passage which makes it certain that the letter was written from Corinth or that the collection was complete at the time of writing.[13] The line, "Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased," refers to their intention rather than their performance and the later line, "When I have completed . . . and delivered," seems to look to two separate events in the future: 1) the completion of the collection, and 2) the delivery of the money. Therefore it is perfectly possible that Romans was written not at Corinth after the completion of the collection but in Macedonia at a time when Paul still hoped that the collection in Achaia would be successful.

[12] It is interesting to speculate whether the Corinthian situation to which I Clement is addressed nearly a half-century later had its roots in the situation described in II Cor. x–xiii.

[13] Cf. T. M. Taylor, "The Place of Origin of Romans," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 281–295, where the weakness of the Corinthian origin is exposed and Philippi suggested as an alternative (after the completion of the collection, however).

His plans for the future he makes clear for the first time. When he has delivered the money he hopes to leave Jerusalem and move toward the west, intending to go as far as Spain (xv.24), for he has already preached from Jerusalem to Illyricum (xv.19) and now wishes to go among people who have not yet heard the name of Christ (xv.20). He speaks at the same time of two fears, that he may have difficulty with the unbelieving Jews in Judea and that his collection may not be acceptable to the Christians in Jerusalem. The first of these fears is understandable, for he had experienced Jewish hostility before. But the second comes as something of a surprise to the reader. Nowhere in his earlier mentions of the collection does he reveal that he has any misgivings as to the friendship of the Jerusalem Christians or their willingness to accept relief from his churches. What can have happened in the interim to make him uneasy?

A clue to the answer to this question may be found in Galatians. According to the first two chapters of that letter Paul had been to Jerusalem on only two occasions between his conversion and the time of writing. The first visit, which took place three years after the conversion, was the occasion for his seeing Cephas and James but none of the other apostles. The second, which took place fourteen years later,[14] was the occasion for his conferring with Cephas, James, and John with regard to the relationship between the Jerusalem church and the Gentile mission. On this visit Paul was accompanied by Barnabas and Titus. The result of the meeting seems to have been an agreement to the effect that the Jewish and Gentile missions, hitherto independent of one another, should remain so, the only stipulation being that the Gentile mission should remember the poor Christians of Jerusalem. Paul seems to be saying that it was agreed that the work of the collec-

[14] On the total length of time involved see C. W. Emmet, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London, 1912), pp. xviii f.; cf. also the works of Knox and Riddle referred to in note 1 above. It should be pointed out that the usual arguments in favor of a 17-year total are inconsistent in that they count the first 3-year period from the conversion instead of the return to Damascus and then, using exactly opposite reasoning, date the 14-year period from the former visit to Jerusalem. Consistency demands either a total elapsed time of 14 years (dating all events from the conversion) or an undetermined total of $x + 3 + 14$, where x equals the unspecified time spent in Arabia. The 17-year total is thus the least likely of all solutions.

tion for the saints should go forward but that in other respects the Gentile mission was to remain quite separate from the Jewish one. That the collection was set in motion as a result of this meeting is indicated by Gal. ii.10: "Only they wanted us to remember the poor, which very thing I made haste to do." [15] According to this interpretation of the verse, Paul set out on the collection trip immediately after his second visit to Jerusalem.

Soon after this visit, however, occurred the conflict with Judaizers at Antioch (Gal. ii.11 ff.). When Galatians was written this breach had not been healed. If it had been, or if any further understanding had been reached, this is precisely what Paul should have written to the Galatians. But he did not. He simply described his relations with the Jerusalem church up to the rupture with Cephas at Antioch and stopped there. The natural inference is that he did so because this was the state of affairs which still obtained when he wrote the letter.

From I Cor. xvi.1 we learn that Paul had somewhat the same relations with the churches of Galatia as with the church in Corinth. He writes to the Corinthians, "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I instructed the churches of Galatia, so you are to do also." This probably means that Paul had been in Galatia shortly before writing I Corinthians, for it seems to have been Paul's plan to visit all the churches which were contributing. Furthermore, there is no sign that Paul was aware of any difficulty with the Galatian churches at this time. He seems to have expected the Galatian offering to be gathered according to his instructions and forwarded to Jerusalem by the same means as that suggested for the delivery of the Corinthian offering (I Cor. xvi.3). That he did not plan to go to Galatia himself is clear from his half-formed plan of wintering at Corinth.[16]

There is no suggestion to be found in I Corinthians that Paul was on anything but friendly terms with the Galatians. When the letter to the Galatians was written, however, there had been a

[15] It is a temptation to translate here, "they wanted us to continue to remember the poor" (taking the present subjunctive to indicate action that was to be habitual), "which very thing I began to busy myself with" (taking the aorist with the inceptive force which it normally bears in verbs of this kind).

[16] If Paul had been to Galatia shortly before writing I Corinthians, then his reference to a Galatian visit as "the former occasion" (Gal. iv.13) is explained.

serious break between Paul and those to whom that letter was addressed. Moreover, Romans, also written while the collection was in progress, mentions only the contributions of Macedonia and Achaia. It says nothing about the churches of Galatia, although it is clear that Galatia originally was expected to contribute to the fund. Is this not an indication that between the writing of I Corinthians and Romans Paul had received news of the defection of the Galatians and had despatched the letter which deals with that defection?

If so, the fears which Paul mentions in Romans take on added meaning. The activities of the Judaizers, first at Antioch and later in Galatia had undermined his confidence in the friendship of the Jerusalem church. Now he was about to return to Jerusalem and wondered whether the breach between the Jewish and Gentile missions had not already become too wide to be healed.

How much time did these events consume? It is clear from I Corinthians that when Paul wrote that letter he hoped that the collection would not take more than six to nine months at the most. In II Cor. ix.2, however, he speaks of Achaia as having been ready since "last year." This probably means that the trouble in Asia (II Cor. i.8 ff.) and the abortive visit to Corinth had delayed matters so long that the collection actually went over into the following year.

On the evidence of the letters alone, then, the following reconstruction of events is possible. After his second visit to Jerusalem Paul started immediately on the collection trip. He travelled to Antioch, where the first disagreement with Judaizers took place, then to Galatia, where he gave instructions for the collection, then to Ephesus, where he wrote I Corinthians. He made a hasty and unsuccessful trip to Corinth (the intermediate visit) and returned to Ephesus, from where he sent Titus to Corinth with the now lost severe letter. After the Asian trouble he went to Troas and then Macedonia, where he met Titus and sent him back to Corinth immediately, bearing II Cor. i–ix. Somewhere in this period he heard of the Galatian defection and wrote Galatians, soon after which he wrote Romans also. II Cor. x–xiii is the latest writing in the whole group and was written after Paul learned of the renewed hostility in Corinth and the accusations against Titus.

Since this hypothesis has been based entirely on the evidence of the letters and does not depend at any point on the information given in Acts, the question must now be asked, to what events told in Acts do these events correspond?

II

The plain meaning of the first two chapters of Galatians is that Paul, when he was writing that letter, had been to Jerusalem only twice since his conversion. A comparison of this account with that given in Acts reveals immediately, however, that the visit which Paul gives as his second corresponds most closely with the visit which Acts places third. There are three solutions to this difficulty which have recommended themselves to critics. The first is that Paul had actually made three visits to Jerusalem but had described only two of them because one of the three was unimportant.[17] This suggestion is the result of reading Acts as the primary source and then finding a way to make the evidence of Galatians agree with it. It does such violence to the plain meaning of Galatians, moreover, that it practically amounts to a repudiation of the authority of the evidence of that letter.

A second solution to the problem is based on the denial that the second visit of Galatians is to be equated with the third visit of Acts. In other words it is asserted that the events of Gal. ii.1 ff. actually took place during the visit which Acts describes at xi.29 f. but the author of Acts omitted to say so.[18] The main difficulty with this solution is that it causes Galatians to be dated before the council visit of Acts xv. This in turn, is placed before the second missionary journey, the long residence in Ephesus, and the collection, during which Paul wrote Romans and I Corinthians. But since Romans is in many ways a restatement of ideas first expressed in I Corinthians and Galatians and resembles Galatians more closely than I Corinthians, it seems unlikely that Galatians and Romans were written so far apart in time. The basic assumption of this solution, like that of the first, is that Acts is the primary source into the framework of which the letters

[17] J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (10th ed., London, 1890), pp. 123–128.

[18] C. W. Emmet, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, pp. xiv–xxii.

are to be fitted. It must be said in favor of this second solution, however, that unlike the first it depends on a natural interpretation of Galatians.

The third solution, which is the one adopted by most modern critics, is that the second and third visits of Acts are a doublet of the same visit.[19] By recognizing the doublet, however, the critic automatically telescopes the whole period of the first missionary journey into nothing. For if the famine visit and the council visit are one and the same there is no room between them for a journey to Cyprus and southern Asia Minor. This new difficulty must be solved either by throwing the events of the first missionary journey before the famine-council visit, or moving this material after the visit in question, or even viewing this whole journey as a doublet with the beginning of the second missionary journey.[20]

These solutions have been advanced by scholars who find in Acts evidence of five visits, the second and third of which are, respectively, the famine and council visits. The text of Acts on which this numbering depends reads as follows: "And the disciples determined, everyone according to his ability, to send relief to the brethren who lived in Judea; and they did so, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul" (xi.29 f.) . . . "And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem when they had fulfilled their mission, bringing with them John called Mark" (xii.25). These two passages, which are separated by the Judean material in xii.1–23, are universally recognized to have come from the same source. As they stand they can only mean that Paul and Barnabas brought the famine relief from Antioch to Jerusalem and having delivered it returned to Antioch. Thus the two passages refer to a single visit. But the best Greek text of Acts xii.25 does not support this interpretation. That text differs from the one translated above in that instead of reading "returned from Jerusalem" it reads "returned to Jerusalem" and must mean

[19] J. Jeremias, "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXVI (1937), 205–221. He states (p. 217): "It is today all but universally recognized that in Acts xi.30/xii.25 on the one hand and Acts xv.1–33 on the other hand one and the same Jerusalem visit of Paul is being described." See also E. Schwartz, "Zur Chronologie des Paulus," Göttingen Nachrichten, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1907, pp. 263–299.

[20] M. H. Shepherd, Jr., "A Venture in the Source Analysis of Acts," Munera Studiosa, ed. by Shepherd and S. E. Johnson (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 92–105.

that Paul and Barnabas, having delivered the relief from Antioch, left Jerusalem to complete the collection and returned to Jerusalem with the proceeds of this further effort. Early scribes, realizing that they had already gone to Jerusalem with the money from Antioch, took *τὴν διακονίαν* to mean the delivery of the money rather than a collection of more funds. That the word can mean the collection itself and not merely the delivery of money is proved by Paul's use of it in II Cor. viii.4, where the larger meaning is clearly required. But once the word was taken to mean "delivery" the remainder of Acts xii.25 made nonsense, for it read, "they returned to Jerusalem." In an effort to remedy this difficulty the text was then altered to read, "they returned from Jerusalem" and a visit of Paul to Jerusalem was caused to vanish.[21] This means that Luke understood his Antioch source to be telling of two visits in connection with the famine and chose to separate the two visits by the insertion of a block of Judean material. At some later time the verse which told of the second famine visit was misinterpreted and the text altered to support the misinterpretation. It is more than possible that the misinterpretation was fostered originally by the obvious discrepancy between the text of Acts and Galatians, a consideration which has helped to keep alive the inferior reading to the present day.

If the first famine visit (xi.29 f.) is Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (Gal. ii.1 ff.), then the second famine visit (Acts xii.25) is precisely that visit which the letters lead us to believe took place after the collection in Macedonia and Achaia. If we were reading the Hellenist source at this point we should have no difficulty in making this identification, for according to that source Paul went to Jerusalem to deliver the Antioch offering and shortly thereafter, having completed the collection, returned to Jerusalem. This identification, of course, involves a drastic revision of the accepted chronology of Paul's life and writing, for if the collection followed closely on the famine relief from Antioch,

[21] There can be little doubt that the reading "to Jerusalem" is correct. Not only is it found in the best MSS (B) but it also is impossible of explanation as a later variant of either *ἀπό* (D) or *ἐξ* (A), its two rivals. If *ἀπό* had been the original reading it is difficult to see how it could have given rise to both *εἰς* and *ἐξ*; likewise, if *ἐξ* had been original it cannot be explained why both *ἀπό* and *εἰς* were substituted for it. But if *εἰς* is original, both *ἀπό* and *ἐξ* are quite simply explained as independent attempts to clear up the difficulty which it caused.

then the collection letters must have been written shortly after the year 46, the most probable date of the famine. If these letters were written as early as this, the chronological arrangement of the missionary journeys is brought into question, for according to Acts Paul did not begin his mission in Europe until several years after the famine of 46. According to the letters, however, Paul had already been to Europe at least once before the collection. There is no possible way in which the narrative of Acts can be harmonized with this sequence of events.[22]

III

A comparison of the letters with Acts suggests that the solution to the problem of their discrepancies lies in the realm of source criticism. Such a solution has been assumed in part in the preceding pages. It is now possible to discuss this analysis in more detail.[23] The problem centers about the Jerusalem visits of Paul. According to Gal. ii.1 ff. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem preceded the Judaistic incident at Antioch. But according to Acts xv.1 ff. the council followed this incident. Can these data be reconciled? If two separate visits are being described the problem is solved and the order of events is as follows: 1) Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (Gal. ii.1 ff.), 2) Judaistic controversy at Antioch (Gal. ii.11 ff. equals Acts xv.1), 3) Council visit (Acts xv.2 ff.).

Now it is really the text of Acts which leads us to single out one of the Jerusalem visits and call it a council. If we had only Galatians we should no more call the second visit a council than the first, for all that is said is that the leaders of the Jerusalem church recognized the work that had been done in the Gentile mission and gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. There is no suggestion in the letter that Paul had gone to

[22] K. Lake, in The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. V (London, 1933), pp. 452–455; K. S. Gapp, "The Universal Famine under Claudius," Harvard Theological Review, XXVIII (1935), 335–337. Knox (JBL, LVIII [1938], 25 n.) has already suggested that Paul's meeting with Priscilla and Aquila should be dated soon after 41 (cf. Lake, Beginnings, vol. V, pp. 459 f.). B. W. Bacon ("Wrath 'Unto the Uttermost,'" Expositor, XXIV [1922], 356–376) suggests the events of the early 40's as the background against which I Thess. ii.14 ff. was written. Cf. also Shepherd, op. cit., p. 96, n. 19.

[23] On the whole matter of source criticism of Acts, see the articles of J. Jeremias and M. H. Shepherd, Jr., referred to above.

Jerusalem to settle a dispute. Instead, the letter is explicit in putting the dispute after the visit. If the decisions of the council had already been reached when Paul wrote Galatians, his omission of any mention of these decisions is inexplicable, for they would have dealt a simple death-blow to the arguments which the Judaizers were using in Galatia. It must be admitted, then, that the identification of the council visit with the second visit of Galatians is not so easy as it is sometimes made to appear. If, however, Acts xv is considered a doublet with Acts xii.25 the difficulties vanish. According to this hypothesis, Paul went to Jerusalem with Barnabas before the collection, met Cephas, James, and John, and then set out on his journey for the raising of the collection. Early in this journey, when Paul was at Antioch, the Judaistic incident occurred. As a result of this incident Paul and Barnabas went their separate ways and did not meet again until their return to Jerusalem after the collection was over, at which time the council took place.

The combination of sources which has made the doublet possible is not difficult to discern. The first twelve chapters of Acts seem to be based in the main on two sources which Luke used alternately. One of these is a cycle of Judean material mainly centering about Peter; the other told of the spread of the gospel among the "Hellenists," and, as a result of the persecution following Stephen's death, among the Gentiles also. This second source underlies xi.19–30 and xii.25, the two passages which tell of the two famine visits. With xiii.1 a third source takes up and continues without a break through xiv.28. At the latter point it is interrupted by the account of the council (xv.1–33) but after the story of the council has been told the third source resumes and underlies most of the material between xv.35 and xviii.23. The reasons for assuming the existence of this third source are as follows. 1) At the beginning of xiii Barnabas and Paul are introduced to the reader anew, as though the story of their adventures were just beginning.[24] 2) Once xvi.1–33 is removed from the

[24] It is true that they are called Barnabas and Saul for the first few verses of this section and the transition to Paul and Barnabas is not made until the story is under way, but this phenomenon is probably the work of Luke, who retained for a few sentences of his new section the diction of the former source and made the transition of names as soon as it could be effected smoothly.

center of this source, a unity of theme and action becomes apparent. It deals with two journeys of Paul, one in company with Barnabas and the other in company with Silas. Its focal point is Antioch; it betrays no interest in Jerusalem whatever. The form in which its incidents are told is the same throughout; Paul and his companion journey to a particular town, preach in the synagogue, attract a following, and consequently excite the jealousy of the Jews, who force them to leave and journey to the next place. Occasionally the hostility of one town follows the missionaries to the next, as in the case of xiv.19 and xvi.13.[25] 3) The removal of xv.1–33 does away with the obvious discrepancy with regard to the movements of Silas which now exists between xv.33 (Silas returns to Jerusalem) and xv.40 (Silas is still in Antioch).[26]

It is unlikely that the story of the council comes from the Judean source, for that material does not deal with Paul. If it is the work of Luke himself it is strange that he has not adapted it to the already told story of the first missionary journey. Instead, it still betrays traces of an origin in the Hellenist source. That source, up to xii.25, where it breaks off, has told of Paul as having been only in Tarsus and Antioch since his departure from Jerusalem. The apostolic decree is addressed to "the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia," precisely the places required by the Hellenist source. The places visited on the first missionary journey are not mentioned until xvi.4, where Luke tells of the delivery of the decree. It is also worthy of note that according to xv.3 Paul and Barnabas passed through Phoenicia and Samaria on their way to Jerusalem, while the Hellenist source in xi.19 has just mentioned the conversion of Phoenicia. Again, in xv.12,25, the names Barnabas and Paul are used in that order, which is a characteristic of the Hellenist source.

On grounds of general suitability no arguments can be raised

[25] These two sections are all the more striking for their mutual resemblance in that they both mention "women of high standing."

[26] In this connection it should be pointed out that according to the third source Barnabas and Silas are not originally sent out from Jerusalem, whereas according to the Hellenist source Barnabas is a Jerusalem Christian who goes to Antioch as an emissary and Silas is one of the representatives of the Jerusalem apostles and elders (xv.22).

for denying xv.1–33 a place in the Hellenist source. It deals with the characters of that source and provides the resolution of the issues which have been raised earlier in its narrative. Its present position seems to be the principal argument for denying it a place in that source, and this difficulty, when examined, is seen to bear little weight.

One of the well-known traits of Luke's style in the Third Gospel as well as in Acts is his fondness for short editorial summaries which serve as transitions between scenes.[27] For the most part these summaries are made up of generalizing statements to the effect that the specific instances given are characteristic of the developing church as a whole. In some cases the summaries serve as guide-posts to enable the reader to thread his way between parallel strands of narrative. A summary of this sort is found in xi.19, where it is explained that the persecution that arose at the time of Stephen's death caused the scattering of Christians as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch. This summary introduces the story of Barnabas and Saul in Antioch by referring the reader back to the point earlier in the narrative which this section logically resumes. In order to make the connection doubly clear, however, Luke has prepared for the resumption of the narrative by inserting in viii.1,4, immediately after the Stephen story, what amounts to a paraphrase of the same summary which he is to use again in xi.19, with the result that the same material now appears twice in the finished story.

In dealing with the Jerusalem visits of Paul, Luke seems to have used the same method of threading his way between parallel stories. He brought the Hellenist source up to the point (xi.30) at which Paul and Barnabas brought the famine relief from Antioch to Jerusalem. Here he set the Hellenist source aside and inserted the story of Peter's imprisonment and the death of Agrippa (xii.1–23). Then follows the summary: "But the word of God grew and multiplied. And Barnabas and Saul returned to Jerusalem when they had fulfilled their mission, bringing with them John, surnamed Mark." This summary closes the preceding section and prepares for the story of the first missionary journey by introducing John Mark. It also provides the point of reference

[27] Cf. H. J. Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts," Beginnings, vol. V, pp. 392–402.

for the council, which, however, cannot be told in full until at least part of the story of Paul's missionary activity has been set before the reader. Acts xii.25, then, is a summary of the council visit, the full telling of which Luke delayed until xv, with the result that when Acts is now dissected under the microscope an extra visit seems to emerge.

Where then, do the events of the journey source (xiii.1–xiv.28, xv.35–xviii.23) belong? The only possible place is before the famine. The explanation of this displacement is to be found in another area of source analysis. Luke intended to end his volume with the diary source which underlies the "we-passages." This story is the fulcrum on which the whole second half of Acts is poised and nowhere in the work is the author's artistry more apparent than in his handling of this material. This is particularly evident in his treatment of the theme of Paul's trials. In Philippi the Roman authorities admit that they have beaten and imprisoned him illegally, in Corinth Gallio refuses to hear the complaints against the apostle, and in Ephesus the city secretary brands the anti-Pauline demonstration as itself a breach of the peace. These judicial incidents serve to set a legal precedent, as it were, by which the reader may guide his judgment of the more important trials that are to come in the closing section of the work. Their position in the book has been chosen with this purpose in mind. They are the only such incidents in the book outside of the "we-passages" and they are placed in the section which introduces the "we-passages."[28] In other words, one of the principal themes of the story of the second missionary journey has been chosen because it would serve to introduce a principal theme of the diary source. This arrangement is almost certainly the work of Luke.[29]

A second point at which Luke's preparation for the events of the diary source is evident is in xix.21 ff.: "Now after these events Paul resolved in the spirit to pass through Macedonia and Achaia and go to Jerusalem, saying, 'After I have been there I must also see Rome.' And having sent into Macedonia two of his helpers,

[28] Paul in real life was in legal difficulties many more times than this. See II Cor. xi.23 ff.

[29] Compare his use of the rejection at Nazareth (Mk. vi.1–6) to introduce the Galilean ministry (Lk. iv.16–30).

Timothy and Erastus, he himself stayed in Asia for a while." This passage is not related closely with the material which surrounds it but rather serves to prepare ahead of time for the introduction of the travel narrative of the following chapter. Its purpose is to reveal the inner thoughts of Paul at this point in his career. Its irony has point, moreover, only if it looks forward to Paul's actual arrival in the capital. As a reminiscence of Paul's Ephesian ministry it has no point at all. Thus the passage must be attributed to Luke rather than to a collection of reminiscences of Paul in Ephesus and the conclusion is inescapable that Luke's knowledge of these plans is most easily explained if he had read Rom. xv.14 ff.

This explanation raises the question of the literary relationship of Acts with the letters of Paul. Among recent critics only Enslin and Knox [30] believe that Luke was acquainted with the letters, while Goodspeed [31] believes that it was the publication of Acts which reawakened interest in Paul and caused the letters to be collected and published. It is obvious that the letters do not constitute a source of Acts which is in any sense comparable with the other sources of the book. Even in the speeches, where a modern writer might be tempted to quote from the genuine letters of the apostle, Luke ignored them. On the other hand it cannot fail to be noticed that after the beginning of the second missionary journey correspondences between the narrative of Acts and the letters are abundant.

The admission, however, that Luke used the letters even in a single instance only complicates the problem, for it means that in many cases where their evidence might have been invaluable he nevertheless did not use it. On the face of it this supposition has appeared so unlikely that most critics have preferred to believe that the correspondences are to be explained by the fact that both Acts and the letters were describing the same events. This conclusion, in turn, has affected the dating of Acts, for it is difficult to explain how a writer interested in Paul could have been ignorant of the letters if he was writing many years after the

[30] M. S. Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul," Journal of the American Oriental Society, LVIII (1938), 81–91. Knox, Marcion and the New Testament (Chicago, 1942), pp. 132 ff.

[31] Introduction to the New Testament (Chicago, 1937), pp. 210 ff.

letters were published. The popularity of the letter-form in the New Testament itself is evidence enough of the early and wide influence which Paul's letters exerted on Christian writers and it is difficult to believe that a literary workman of the caliber of Luke could have remained unaffected by them if they were available.

These are weighty arguments. And yet there is reason to believe that they are not decisive. In writing the Third Gospel Luke used his sources one at a time. When he followed Mark he reproduced only the material in Mark; when he set Mark aside in favor of another source he did not conflate it with the non-Marcan narrative. In other words, for any given section he chose the source which he preferred and followed that source as his authority. On the supposition that the same method was employed in the composition of Acts it will be seen that Luke's apparent ignorance of the letters at any point in his narrative is quite simply explained. He may have possessed the letters and known their contents and still not have reproduced them because they were not his preferred source. That they almost never ranked as his preferred source again is not difficult to explain. He was writing connected narrative from sources which contained connected narrative, and the letters contain almost no narrative at all. In fact the passage from Romans referred to above is one of the few paragraphs in all the letters which could serve Luke's purpose. The slightly longer passage in Galatians might, it is true, have supplied him with an account of Paul's first two Jerusalem visits, but another source, or possibly two other sources, told of these visits also and it was these sources which Luke preferred.

A modern historian, trained to respect primary sources, may find it hard to believe that Luke could have made so unscientific a choice. One must beware, however, of reading back into the ancient world the scientific assumptions of a more recent era. The writing of history in the culture of Luke's day was looked on more as an art than a science. The historian considered his task to be not merely or even primarily the selection and presentation of facts but rather the portrayal of important events and the portraiture of the men who figured in them. Thus in the selection

of sources he was moved by considerations quite different from those which weigh heavily in modern historical writing. Least of all did he share our modern reverence for facts simply as facts. This is not to say that the ancient historian made no attempt to write accurately. He prided himself on having employed reliable sources and having used care in arranging his material. But having satisfied himself that his source was trustworthy he used it without verifying its every statement of fact and questioning its every interpretation.

This being the case, it cannot be argued, simply because the evidence of the letters is not presented in many sections of Acts where a modern counterpart would surely give this evidence, that Luke did not know the letters. That he did not use the letters as a continuous source needs no demonstration. But in one section of the work, roughly that between xv.36 and xix.40, there are a number of indications that Luke used the letters, or some of them, as a guide in arranging his material. Luke's knowledge of Paul's plans when the latter wrote Romans has already been mentioned. The order of events which surround this section is no less remarkable, for it is precisely the order upon which one would hit after reading Romans and I Corinthians. Paul decides to leave Ephesus and go to Macedonia, Achaia, Jerusalem, and then Rome. He sends Timothy and Erastus ahead and remains in Ephesus himself for a while, then finally makes his way along the route he has announced. Luke's ignorance of the purpose of the mission of Timothy and Erastus and his lack of any explanation for Paul's decision to stay in Ephesus reflect at least partial dependence on the letters, for it is these bits of information which the letters fail to give also. It seems probable, therefore, that Luke, knowing of some occasion when Timothy and Erastus went from Ephesus to Macedonia has used the hint of I Corinthians in order to place this incident in the sequence of events and has even borrowed from Romans his information about Paul's further plans.

There are also other correspondences which may be explained on the assumption that Luke was being guided by the letters. Acts xv.36 ff. sets the scene for the second missionary journey by introducing Silas and Timothy in place of Barnabas and Mark.

The introduction of Timothy is accomplished by telling the story of his circumcision at Lystra, but this is the only incident which is told for the whole journey from Antioch to Troas, the remainder of the journey being covered by a general summary. The full narrative of events does not begin until Paul sees the vision of the man from Macedonia and decides to carry his work to Europe. Timothy, who has been introduced as though he were to be a character in the story, does not appear again until xvii.14, at which point the Macedonian mission is over. When Timothy does reappear it is as the companion of Silas when the latter is separated from Paul at Beroea (xvii.14 f.) and reunited with him at Corinth (xviii.5). This being the case, it would seem that Timothy was not a character in the original story of the second missionary journey at all but has been written into it by Luke. The point at which he is written in, moreover, has been suggested by I Thess. i.1, and iii.1 f.

One might object that the account in Acts does not fit exactly with the evidence of I Thessalonians, since according to the letter Paul seems to be moving toward Macedonia rather than away from it and Timothy's trip is from Athens to Macedonia and back, while Acts pictures both men as moving south at different times. Apparently Luke has been led into this discrepancy by his source's telling of Silas staying in Beroea and then following Paul south. Into this story, which is not too obviously at variance with the letter, he has inserted Timothy's name. This insertion seems to have involved a critical assumption on Luke's part with regard to I Thessalonians, namely that that letter was written shortly after Paul's first visit to Macedonia. Once it is seen that the mention of Timothy in connection with these events may be the *result* of just this dating of I Thessalonians by Luke, the usual modern arguments for so dating the letter are seriously weakened, if not done away with altogether. In other respects the correspondences between I Thessalonians and the journey source were so close in this area that the insertion of Timothy's name seemed called for. And one can hardly blame Luke too severely for failing to see that the insertion involved a twisting of the evidence about Timothy's movements, for the same twisting is still standard exegesis of the letter.

As Acts moves to Athens and Corinth exact correspondences cease to be found. Perhaps the placing of Paul's philosophical speech at Athens and Luke's surprisingly Pauline admission that the speech was a failure may be explained on the theory that Luke had read I Cor. ii.1 f. As Acts leaves Corinth it summarizes in six verses Paul's trip to Ephesus, Caesarea, Antioch, Galatia, and Phrygia and does not resume detailed story-telling until it introduces Apollos at Ephesus. Luke needs no more than the evidence of I Corinthians to know that Apollos should be introduced at this point. Indeed a knowledge of I Corinthians is all that is required to explain why Luke has placed the major part of Paul's Ephesian activity in this section.

It is clear, then, that at a number of points in this section Luke's arrangement of material is most easily explained on the assumption that he knew at least Romans, I Corinthians, and I Thessalonians. The difficulty with this explanation is that much information which Luke might have drawn from the letters is missing. Why has he omitted all mention of Titus and failed to describe the collection? Both of these questions are answered if Luke did not use II Corinthians and Galatians. Whether he ignored them intentionally because their subject matter was not suitable to his irenic purpose, or simply did not know their contents, it is impossible to say, though one may suspect that neither was his favorite epistle. Without II Corinthians a reader would naturally assume that the collection was not a single event but a regular practice in Paul's ministry. Indeed, even when faced with the ample evidence of that letter many commentators have thought this and have considered the reference to "alms and offerings" in Paul's speech before Felix an adequate mention of the collection on Luke's part.

That the phrase was intended to refer to the collection no one doubts. But it is to be observed that it occurs not in the diary source proper but in a speech of Luke's own composition. In other words, the diary originally had said nothing about the collection, because as a matter of fact the collection had been completed long before Paul's last visit to Jerusalem. It was Luke himself who assumed on the basis of the letters that the diary was describing the trip to which Romans and I Corinthians allude. And

it was this mistake more than any other single factor that led him to place the whole story of Paul's missionary activity too late.[32]

It remains only to summarize the conclusions of this investigation. The evidence of the letters shows that the collection took place before the Jerusalem council and not after it. It also shows that Paul had been in Europe on one occasion before the collection was taken. This leads to the conclusion that the journey source in Acts has been dated too late by Luke and should be understood as describing events which took place before the council.

If the famine occurred in 46/47 and a period of about two years was consumed with the taking of the collection, then the council would date in 48 at the earliest and the collection letters would have been written between these two points, I Corinthians in the spring of 47, and Galatians, Romans, II Cor. i–ix, and II Cor. x–xiii in 47/48.[33]

Adopting the more than 17 year interval between Paul's conversion and the famine visit would place the conversion in 29 at the latest; the 14 year interval would place it in 32, which seems more likely.[34] The date 55 for the trial before Festus is probably accurate. If so, and Paul was arrested two years before this time, the interval between council and arrest amounts to about 5 years at most, in which period the long Ephesian residence is probably to be placed.[35]

A narrative summary based on these data would be as follows: Paul was converted in 32. After a three-year period in Arabia and

[32] Whether Luke himself was the author of the diary is an unanswerable question. He does not hesitate to use a section of the diary out of place (xvi.10–17, or its kernel, belongs in xx.1–3, where it is now replaced by a summary) but this may be simply his literary convention for telling the reader that he was present on the earlier occasion. See H. J. Cadbury, "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," Expositor, XXI (1921), 431–441; "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface," Expositor, XXIV (1922), 401–420.

[33] These are the earliest possible dates. The events may have happened a year or so later.

[34] If, as Knox has suggested, the 14 years of Gal. ii.1 is the same as the 14 years of II Cor. xii.2, then the shorter interval has preference.

[35] If Luke is correct in naming Gallio as the proconsul before whom Paul was tried in Corinth, then it is probable that Paul returned to Corinth shortly before the final trip to Jerusalem. The present position of the incident in Acts does not preclude this possibility, for Luke generally tells all incidents connected with a given town as though they occurred on Paul's first visit there.

Damascus he paid the first of his visits to Jerusalem (as a Christian). After this visit he began the mission which took him, in company with Barnabas, to Cyprus and southern Asia Minor and later, in company with Silas, to Macedonia and Achaia. At the close of this period Paul was in Antioch when word came of the Judean famine. With Barnabas he travelled to Jerusalem to deliver the famine relief collected in Antioch. This was his second Jerusalem visit and probably occurred in 46. On this occasion he reported to the Jerusalem authorities what he had accomplished on his mission to the Gentiles and the authorities in turn approved his actions and suggested that further relief money be collected in the churches of the Gentile mission. Paul left Jerusalem on the collection trip immediately. In Antioch occurred the incident over table-fellowship; in Galatia he gave instructions for the taking of the collection. By the spring of 47 he reached Ephesus and wrote I Corinthians. After his intermediate visit to Corinth and the persecution in Asia he continued the work of the collection, going next to Macedonia, where he wrote II Cor. i–ix. In this period also Galatians and Romans were written, the latter probably at about the same time as II Cor. i–ix. Further trouble in Corinth called forth II Cor. x–xiii, the last of Paul's extant writing from this period. On the completion of the collection, or as much of it as could be accomplished, Paul returned to Jerusalem. On this visit, his third, the question of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions, which had come to a head during the collection, was discussed and settled at the council. After the council Paul probably made his way to Ephesus, where he resided until his last trip to Jerusalem. (The "Ephesian imprisonment," if it occurred, may have taken place during this period.) Paul arrived in Jerusalem in 53, was imprisoned for two years and sent to Rome in 55.

The advantages of this hypothesis are obvious. It does away with the necessity for "years of silence" and the attendant necessity for placing all of Paul's missionary activity in the last few years of his life; it also provides an understandable background against which the collection letters may be dated. In addition it goes far toward removing the suspicion that Acts is either semi-fiction or the product of an extreme tendency on the part of

Luke, for it shows that the sources of Acts are generally trustworthy, although they have at one point, as the result of an honest mistake on the part of Luke, been used in the wrong order. Finally it provides a simple and straightforward account of the crisis which arose over the collision between the Jerusalem church and the churches of the Gentile mission, a crisis which figured so largely in Paul's writing and was of such enormous importance for the shaping of his thought.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Sources for a Biography

II The Early Life of Paul

III The Date of Paul's Consecration

IV The Trial of Athanasius

V Christian Political Theory

VI Paul's First and Second Exiles

VII Civil War in Constantinople

VIII The Prefect Philip

IX The Final Stage

Appendix. The Date of Sardica

PAUL OF CONSTANTINOPLE

W. TELFER
Selwyn College, Cambridge, England

I. Sources for a Biography

The story of Paul, the first man to be consecrated as bishop of Constantinople, has come down to us only in fragments.[1] Le Nain de Tillemont made the first modern attempt to fit the fragments together into a biography.[2] His work is characterized by a sagacity not always exhibited by more recent writers.[3] An addition was made to the fragments previously known by the discovery of passages referring to Paul in the 'codex Theodosianus' [4] belonging to the Chapter Library of Verona. This material was brought into use by E. Schwartz in the ninth of his now-famous articles "Zur Geschichte des Athanasius," where he touches on Paul as an associate of Athanasius.[5] The passages in the 'codex Theodosianus' are in Latin, but they derive ultimately from an Alexandrine work of ecclesiastical history otherwise almost wholly lost. This work, to judge from internal evidences, was composed in 368 to celebrate the forty-years' episcopate of Athanasius, and its theme might be called "The contendings for the faith of the bishops of Alexandria." It is not obvious why such a work should contain anything about either Paul or Constantinople. And a comparison of the Paul passages with those that concern themselves with Alexandrine history is much to the disadvantage of the former. For

[1] Those known to historians from the first are: Socrates, H.E., ii,6.7.12.13.15–18.20.22.23.26.27, and v,9. Sozomen, H.E., iii,3.4.7–10.13.24, iv,2.3, and vii,10. Theodoret, H.E., ii,5. Hilary, Hist. frag. iv,1. Athanasius, De fuga, 3. Hist. Ar. 7. Apart from the events of 342 none of these sources offers assured chronology.

[2] Mémoires, vii (1706) 251–260.

[3] The article Paulus (18) in the Dictionary of Christian Biography, appearing over the initials of Canon W. M. Sinclair is so slipshod as to be useless. V. Schultze, Altchristliche Städte u. Landschaften, I, Konstantinopel (1913), 44–48 uses some violence on the fragments, and declares the problem of fitting them insoluble. (44, Note 5).

[4] Codex LX(58), described by W. Telfer in Harvard Theological Review, XXXVI (1943) 169–246.

[5] Nachrichten v. d. Kgl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, (Phil. hist. Kl.) 1911, 475–9, 511–16 (hereafter cited as Schwartz.l.c.).

Alexandrine affairs, this History will quickly be seen to be a source of first-rate authority. But the Paul-passages contain manifest chronological errors and bizarre views. Whatever were the means by which the Alexandrine author got his information about Paul, they left him at the mercy of his own misconceptions. Schwartz therefore found this additional source of information of somewhat problematical value. Such was the position with which the present writer found himself confronted; with one hope of advance, should the field of hagiography yield any further material of value. The hagiography of Paul himself is of no aid. There are two Greek *legenda*, one in the Bibliotheca of Photius [6] and one in the June supplement to the Metaphrast,[7] the historical matter in either case being wholly from Socrates. But Sozomen tells us [8] of a popular cultus already arising in his time around the tombs of two ecclesiastics of Paul's household, Martyrius and Marcian. This cultus established itself, and these saints became known to the Greek church as "the Holy Notaries," with their commemoration on 25 October. Their legend in Symeon Metaphrastes is by the Metaphrast himself,[9] and no one can read it without feeling the presence of historical knowledge not derived from the well-known church histories. In particular, this legend lays the blame for the troubles of the orthodox of Constantinople not principally on ecclesiastics but upon two imperial officials, the Chamberlain Eusebius and the Praetorian Prefect Philip [10]—Εὐσεβίου μάλιστα καὶ Φιλίππου, (ὧν ὁ μὲν τῇ τοῦ πραιποσίτου τετίμητο δόξῃ, ὁ δὲ τὰ τῆς ἐπαρχίας διεῖπεν, ὁ Φιλίππος) ὑπέκκαυμα Κωνσταντίῳ τοῦ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν ἔρωτος γενομένων. If, therefore, we could get at what lies behind the Metaphrast, we might have found a first-class source of knowledge about the times of Paul. Now Albert Ehrhard, in his remarkable survey of the early hagiographical tradition of the Greek Church,[11] shows the existence of a legend of the Holy Notaries, with the *incipit* ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ τελει-

[6] No. 257 in the Bibliotheca (P.G., civ, 120–132) (B.H.G., 1472).
[7] P.G., cxvi, 884–96. (B.H.G., 1473).
[8] H.E., iv, 3.
[9] P.G., cxv, 1289–92.
[10] L.c., 1292AB.
[11] Überlieferung u. Bestand der hagiographischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche, Texte u. Untersuchungen, 4te Reihe, 50 and 51 (1937–8).

ωθῆναι in two MSS of the 12th, and six of the 11th century,[12] and believes that there are the signs of its presence in a palimpsest of the 9th century.[13] Already from the 11th century he finds twenty MSS containing the Metaphrast's legend for the Holy Notaries.[14] The occurrence of the legend ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ τελειωθῆναι is entirely in legendaries (of some five different types), as a lection for 25 October. It thus appears that, until the influence of the Metaphrast predominated, the makers of legendaries who wanted to include a lection for the Holy Notaries copied the *legendum* ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ τελειωθῆναι. The legendaries known to Ehrhard that include this commemoration in any form are but a small minority, and the most natural supposition is that they were all written in Constantinople. One of them Cod. Athon. Lawra 426 (a four-month Autumn menology) is dated by the scribe, from Constantinople, in 1039. And it would be a reasonable guess that the archetype of the legend lay in the church of the Holy Notaries. It is evident, therefore, that the text of this pre-Symeon legend is a desideratum, as possibly giving fresh material for the history of Paul. Consequently, the publication, the year before last, by Father Franchi de' Cavalieri, of two recensions of the *legendum*,[15] gives occasion for reopening the whole question. So far as concerns their essential story, the text of the two recensions is identical. Difference is to be seen only in what may be termed "the padding." We may presume an archetype slightly shorter than either recension, which the scribes of the recensions respected so far as to copy them, instead of rewriting them in paraphrase, while allowing themselves a certain amount of free amplification. Thus Franchi de' Cavalieri was able to print in leaded type what may be regarded as roughly the text of the archetype.[16] He argues that its date of composition must be later than 439, because it defines the position of the church of the Holy Notaries at Constantinople [17] as ἐν τῇ Μελαντιαδησίᾳ πόρτῃ,

[12] Op. cit., 50, 170, 349–51, 353–5, 372–3, 462–3.

[13] 50, 117.

[14] 51, 387.

[15] Analecta Bollandiana, LXIV (1946) 132–175. "Una pagina di storia Bizantina del secolo iv, il Martirio dei Santi Notari."

[16] The text of the recensions is given on pp. 169–175.

[17] The detailed argument is on pp. 152–164.

a formula which postulates the existence of the wall of Theodosius II. On the other hand, there is nothing in the document that suggests a later date than the middle fifth century. On the contrary, if we consider its character as hagiography, it is difficult to suppose it to be the work of any hagiographer of the sixth century or later. It is devoid of appeal to the marvellous, and claims the reader's admiration for the Holy Notaries solely on the ground of their steadfastness in the orthodox faith, under persecution. This implies that the Constantinopolitan public for which the legend was composed reacted keenly to the anti-Arian interest, and was ready to dispense with embellishments which soon came to be indispensable in hagiography. The greater part of the *legendum* is not about the Holy Notaries at all, but about Paul. In fact nothing in the common text of the two recensions lies outside the theme of the misfortunes of orthodoxy in Constantinople, from Alexander to Eudoxius, except what Père Delehaye has called the "coordinates" of the cultus (of the Holy Notaries), to wit, the place and date of their annual synaxis.[18] When Sozomen wrote, the place was outside the land-wall of Constantine. When the author of the *legendum* wrote, it was within the wall of Theodosius. Sozomen's chapter on the Notaries provides such excellent material for a *legendum* that we can safely conclude that the author of ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ τελειωθῆναι did not know of it. These facts taken together suggest that this *legendum* is, as such, very little younger than Sozomen. And it may have been the fact that the sanctuary of the Holy Notaries had become an intramural church of Constantinople that brought about the provision of this *legendum*, which, we may conclude, was made up, purely and simply, out of an ancient history in which the martyrdom of the Holy Notaries figured, by the addition of the new topographical notice of their shrine, and the date of their annual commemoration. It is, in short, not hagiography at all, but history taken into service to provide a lection. Thus, when we have removed the "coordinates" from the text common to Franchi de' Cavalieri's two recensions, the residue is the text of an ancient history of the misfortunes of orthodoxy in Constantinople. Anyone to whom is

[18] Cinq Leçons sur la méthode hagiographique, (Subsidia Hagiographica 21) 1934, Chapter 1.

familiar the text of that item of the 'codex Theodosianus' which Batiffol edited under the title of Historia Acephala Arianorum [19] must see, as soon as he studies the text of this ancient history contained in the *legendum* of the Holy Notaries, that there is word-for-word correspondence between a great part of it, and the second section, in Batiffol's edition, of the Historia Acephala. The correspondence is such as to leave no doubt of some very close connection between the two documents. Franchi de' Cavalieri jumped to the conclusion that the author of the legend drew directly upon the original Greek of the Alexandrine history of which the Historia Acephala is a partial Latin version. This is, however, too hasty a conclusion, as the reader will see when he studies, side by side, the history incorporated in the legend and the passages in the codex Theodosianus referring to Paul, as follows:

'Codex Theodosianus'	Common text of the *Legendum*
[ ] = Tunc temporis.	
(1) ('Codex Theodosianus' f. 71, *v.*) Tunc temporis ingerebantur molestiae imperatoribus synodum convocare, ut insidiarentur Paulo episcopo Constantinopolitano per suggestionem Eusebii, Acacii, Theodori, Valentis, Stephani et sociorum ipsorum: et congregata est synodus consulatu Constantini et Constantini apud Sardicam . . .	(1) [Ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ τελειωθῆναι τὸν μακαριώτατον Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον μετὰ τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς καὶ γενναίους ἀγῶνας ἐν καλῇ πίστει, χειροτονηθῆναι δὲ εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ Παῦλον ἐπίσκοπον, τὸν γενόμενον καὶ ὁμολογητήν.] Εὐσέβιος οὖν ὁ πραιπόσιτος οὐκ ἐπαύετο ἀπειλῶν καὶ ἐκφοβῶν τὴν ἁγιωτάτην τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν καὶ διενοχλῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ Κωνσταντίῳ τῷ υἱῷ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, ὥστε γενέσθαι σύνοδον ἐν Σαρδικῇ πρὸς τὸ καθαιρεθῆναι τὸν μακαριώτατον Παῦλον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.
(2) ('Codex Theodosianus' f.105) consulibus Hypatio et Catulino, Theodorus, Narcissus, Georgius,	(2) συνῆλθον οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Θεόδωρος καὶ Νάρκισσος, Γεώργιος, Ἀκάκιος,

[19] Mélanges Cabrières (1899), I, 100–108.

cum ceteris, venerunt Constantinopoli, volentes suadere Paulo communicare sibi, qui nec verbo eos suscepit, etiam eorum salutationem anathematizavit.

Στέφανος, Μηνοφάντης, Οὐρσάκιος, καὶ Βάλης μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων, βουλόμενοι πεῖσαι τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον συνκοινωνῆσαι αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ οὔτε λόγον. αὐτῶν ἐδέξατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν αὐτῶν ἀνεθεμάτισεν. ὡς δὲ συνεκροτήθη ἡ σύνοδος ἐν Σαρδικῇ, ἀπέστειλαν μετακαλέσασθαι τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον, ὅνπερ οὐ συνεχώρησεν ὁ λαὸς ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως.

(cf. Theodoret, H.E.,ii,5,2.)

ἀλλὰ Παῦλον τηνικαῦτα οὐκ εἴασεν ὁ λεὼς εἰς τὴν Σαρδικὴν ἀπαχθῆαι, τὰς τῶν ἐναντίων ὀρρωδήσας ἐπιβουλάς.

(5)
comitem Hermogene transmisi ut eum eiciat. quo audito populus per mediam civitatem extraxit Hermogenem

(3)
ἀπεστάλη οὖν κόμης τις ὀνόματι Ἑρμογένης ὡς ὀφείλων τὸν Παῦλον οἷα δήποτ' οὖν προφάσει ἐκβάλλειν τῆς πόλεως. ἰδόντες δε οἱ ὄχλοι συνέσχον τὸν κόμητα Ἑρμογένην καὶ σύραντες αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πόλεως ἀπέκτειναν λιθοβολοῦντες. ὁ δε ἔπαρχος τῆς πόλεως θεασάμενος τὴν γεναμένην ταραχὴν φυγὰς ᾤχετο.

(3)
adsumentes itaque secum Eusebium [nicommedensem] insidiati sunt beatissimo Paulo, et interponentes calumniam illi de Constante et Magnentio expulerunt Constantinopolim,

(4)
πάλιν οὖν Θεόδωρος καὶ Γεώργιος καὶ Ἀκάκιος καὶ οἱ τούτοις ὅμοιοι ἐπισπασάμενοι μεθ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ Εὐσέβιον τὸν [Νικομηδείας ἐπίσκοπον] καὶ συκοφαντοῦντες ἔλεγον κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτιπερ Μαγνέντιος ἔγραψεν Παύλῳ καὶ Παῦλος Μαγνεντίῳ.

(3a)
quo possint locum habere et arianam eresis seminare. populus autem Constantinopolitanus disiderans beatissimum Paulum perseveravit seditionibus ne ducerentur ex urbe, amantes sanam doctrinam eius.

πάντα γὰρ ἐποίουν καὶ ἔσπευδον ὅπως δυνηθῶσιν αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλειν τῆς πόλεως. ὁ δὲ λαὸς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπιποθοῦντες τὴν εὐσεβῆ διδασκαλίαν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου, ἀνθίσταντο μὴ συγχωροῦντες αὐτὸν ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, πάνυ γὰρ ἠγάπων αὐτόν.

(4)
imperator sane iratus (here follows (5)) ex qua re occassione nancta adversum episcopum exiliaverunt eum in Armoenia.

[ ] = 3(a)

volens Eudoxium hereseos arriane socium et participem Theodorus cum ceteris throno civitatis imponere, ordinatum Germanice, populo vero moto ad seditionem et non permittente quemquam sedere in throno beati Pauli.
adsumentes Macedonium Pauli presbyterum ordinaverunt episcopum Constantinopolitane civitatis, quem omnis episcoporum conventus damnavit quoniam adversus suum patrem impositionem manus hereticorum impie suscepit. Macedonius tamen postquam communicavit illis et subscripsi occassiones ingesserunt nullius momenti. et amoventes de ecclesia constituunt Eudoxium supradictum antiochensem.

(6)
unde in hac secessione Macedoniani appellantur circa spiritum sanctum naufragantes.

(4)
ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος σφόδρα ἀγανακτήσας (5) ἔνεκεν τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας, ἀποστείλας συνέλαβεν τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον, [βουλόμενος κυρῶσαι τὴν τῶν Ἀρειανῶν αἵρεσιν,] καὶ ἐξώρισεν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀρμενίαν. Εὐσέβιος δὲ ὁ (Νικομηδείας) καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ αἱρεσιάρχαι ἐσκέπτοντο Εὐδόξιόν τινα, τῆς λύμης τῶν Ἀρειανῶν, προβάλλεσθαι εἰς προεδρίαν. ἐπιφυεὶς δὲ πάλιν ὁ λαὸς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἤρξατο στασιάζειν καὶ μὴ συγχωρεῖν τοῦτον καθεσθῆναι εἰς τὸν θρόνον Παύλου. ἔπειτα ἐπισχόντες Μακεδόνιόν τινα πρεσβύτερον Παύλου (lacuna) ἀνεθεμάτισεν, διότι κατὰ τοῦ ἰδιοῦ πατρὸς κατεδέξατο ὑπὸ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αἱρετικῶν χειροτονίαν. τοῦτον οὖν τὸν Μακεδόνιον μετὰ τὸ συγκοινωνῆσαι αὐτοῖς καὶ καθυπογράψαι, οὐ μετὰ πολὺν καιρὸν εἰς οὐδὲν λογισάμενοι, μετεκίνησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ κατέστησαν τὸν προλεχθέντα Εὐδόξιον τὸν Ἀντιοχείας.
(Franchi de' Cavalieri fills the above lacuna thus: προχειρίζονται· τοῦτον δὲ ἡ σύνοδος τῶν ὀρθοδόξων) [ἐξιόντος δὲ τοῦ Μακεδονίου τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐπηκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πτωχοὶ πλείονες. ἦν γάρ, φησίν, ὁ ἄνθρωπος φιλόπτωχος.]

(6)
ταύτῃ οὖν τῇ ὑποθέσει Μακεδονιανοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ναυαγοῦντες.

The following considerations tell against the hypothesis of Franchi de' Cavalieri. The continuous story of the Greek document answers to two passages in the 'codex Theodosianus,' widely separated, and only seen by inference to derive from one and the

same work. Both passages in the codex contain consular dates, marking an interval of seven years. In the original Alexandrine History, therefore, these passages must have been separated by a considerable part of the adventures of Athanasius. The dates, present in the Latin, are absent from the Greek. And yet, as we shall now show, it is not the Latin that has the events in correct sequence, but the Greek. On Franchi de' Cavalieri's hypothesis, therefore, the hagiograper omitted the dates given in the Alexandrine history, but corrected its chronological blunders. Such action is not in the manner of those times, and least of all is it to be expected in hagiographical *legenda*. The comparison of the two passages, as regards chronological order, is as follows. The Latin begins with the date *consulibus Hypatio et Catulino*, thinly disguising an original ὑπατευόντων Λιμενίου καὶ Κατουλλίνου (349). Against this year the Paschal Chronicle [20] has the entry ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπάτων ἀπεκτάνθη Κώνστας ἐν Γαλλίαις ὑπὸ Μαγνεντίου, ἄρξας ἔτη ιβ′. And it is to the conspiracy of Magnentius that the Latin proceeds, by way of a prior (but undated) conspiracy of Paul's enemies. But immediately follows the riot at Constantinople, which actually took place in 342, in which Hermogenes, *Magister equitum*, was done to death. And thence it proceeds to Paul's final exile in 352, as though it were the consequence of the riot. In the Greek, Paul's breach with the Eusebians is on the eve of Sardica (i.e. early summer of 342), and the Hermogenes riot follows immediately. But Paul's enemies have to wait for their revenge till the conspiracy of Magnentius, and, even so, it is only after a period of popular resistance, and the deliberate action of the Emperor, that Paul is finally dismissed and the fortunes of Constantinopolitan orthodoxy ruined. Here, without any attempt at chronology, every event is in its correct order. And the most natural explanation is that we have here the original narrative of the two, told by one to whom the order of the events was a matter of personal knowledge. Once we thus reverse the relationship assumed by Franchi de' Cavalieri, and suppose the ancient history, incorporated in the *legendum*, to have been the Alexandrine historian's source for the tragedy of Paul, everything finds

[20] Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (hereafter cited as C.S.H.B.), Chronicon Paschale, (Edn.L.Dindorf, 1832) I, 535.

its explanation. The Alexandrine knew nothing of the Hermogenes incident, but it seemed to him to offer adequate reason for the Emperor's anger and Paul's exile to Armenia, and he transposed it so as to represent the exile as its immediate consequence. And he covered the whole group of undated events contained in his source with the date of the only one to which he could assign a date, namely the conspiracy of Magnentius. The preceding section of the Historia Acephala refers to events of 346, and the sections that follow contain the dates 353 and 355 respectively, so that the Alexandrine historian might well suppose that he had inserted his notice of Paul at the right point. We may conclude that the more ancient history in the hands of the Alexandrine historian was one whose text is contained in the Greek column above and that it was his sole source of knowledge about Paul and church affairs in the capital. Those portions of the Greek text, above, which have no corresponding Latin, may nevertheless belong to the ancient history, being, for some reason, omitted either by the Alexandrine writer or by the Latin versionist. Thus, in Section 3, above, the clause λιθοβολοῦντες . . . ᾤχετο might be left out for the sake of brevity, and the opening sentence in Section 1 as irrelevant; while, in Section 2, ὡς δὲ . . . πόλεως might be omitted because Sardica, to which it refers, had been dealt with a good deal earlier in the Alexandrine history. On the other hand, the characterization of Eudoxius in the Latin as *ordinatum Germanice*, while it may be an insertion due to the Alexandrine writer's knowledge, might point to an omission by the hagiographer. The moving back, by the Alexandrine writer, of the phrase κυρῶσαι τὴν τῶν Ἀρειανῶν αἵρεσιν from Section 5 to Section 3, above, may mean that he preferred to blame "the Eusebians" rather than the Emperor. It will be seen, later, that it is characteristic of the ancient history to glory in being at war with Constantius and his officers. We may conclude, therefore, that the phrase is in its right position in the Greek.

The phrase ἐξιόντος . . . φιλόπτωχος and Section 6 are missing from Franchi de' Cavalieri's second recension. The presence of Section 6 in the Latin shows that it must, nevertheless, have been part of the common source. This is not the case, however, with ἐξιόντος . . . φιλόπτωχος which we may therefore attribute to

the hand of the hagiographer. With the possible exception of that phrase, the whole of the Greek column above may be taken as text of the ancient history.

After that part of Franchi de' Cavalieri's common text which corresponds with the Latin of the Historia Acephala, (i.e. after the final disappearance of Paul) the text common to the two recensions of the Legend of the Holy Notaries continues to narrate the sufferings of the orthodox at Constantinople. The next sentence [21] runs:

(7) ἡ οὖν (καθολικὴ) ἐκκλησία ἦν συγκεχυμένη καὶ Φίλιππος δὲ ὁ ἔπαρχος εἶλκεν (τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους σφοδρῶς, μάλιστα) τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας Παύλῳ· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς κληρικοὺς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν οἰκεῖν συνεχώρει, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν συλλαμβάνων εἰς ἐξορίαν παρέπεμπεν, τοὺς δὲ ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ ἐσφράγιζεν καὶ ἔλεγεν· Οὗτοι τῶν Παυλιανιστῶν εἰσιν. (the words in brackets may be the hagiographer's).

It seems to find an echo in the Metaphrast's ἐντεῦθεν ἄτιμοι κατὰ μετώπων γραφαὶ ὑποσημαίνουσαι τὸ ὀρθόδοξον.[22] It is (apart from the bracketed words) to be added, with reasonable confidence, as a seventh section, to the text of the ancient history. It is followed by a statement that among these sufferers were the two Lectors of the blessed Paul, Marcian and Martyrius, who withstood Philip boldly in the faith of God, and suffered death. Here the hagiographer inserted his note on the place of the tombs, after which he continued, for one more sentence, the text of his source, as follows: [23]

(8) Δεινῶς οὖν ἐπεκράτει ὁ διωγμός· καὶ τῶν μὲν ἐθνῶν ὁ πόλεμος ἐπέπαυτο, ἀλλὰ γεγραφήκει Εὐσέβιος πραιπόσιτος ὁ εὐνοῦχος τῷ ἐπάρχῳ. ὅπως μηδεὶς λάβῃ ἀνόνας (sic) ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, ἐὰν μὴ κοινωνήσῃ Εὐδοξίῳ καὶ τῇ αἱρέσει τῶν Ἀρειανῶν· οὕτως γεγόνασιν πλεῖστοι αἱρετκοί, μαλιστα οἱ ἔχοντες ἀννόνας.

This is the text of the first recension, and if it is accepted as text of the eighth section of the common source, as is reasonable, the corresponding matter in the second recension must be accounted a paraphrase. To this eighth section we may add a sentence,

[21] Analecta Bollandiana, l.c., p. 170, lines 25–30.
[22] P.G., CXV, 1292B.
[23] Analecta Bollandiana, l.c., p. 171.

which seems to correspond with the Latin of the opening sentence of Section 13 *bis* in Batiffol's edition of the Historia Acephala.[24] The comparison is as follows:

(Apud Constantinopolim) autem Eudoxius Germanice (tenebat ecclesiam) et erat inter eum et Macedonium heresis.	κατεμερίσθησαν δὲ οἱ μὲν μετὰ Εὐδοξίου, οἱ δὲ μετὰ Μακεδονίου.

The statement, in Section 5 above, that the translation of Eudoxius to Constantinople from Germanicia was mooted in (apparently) 351, would suggest that he was to come into the story again later. And that gives us the more ground for assurance that our Section 8 really belongs to the ancient history. Section 13 *bis* of the Historia Acephala, after the above opening words, is a derisive account of an *alia pejor heresis* introduced through Eudoxius. This is not reproduced in the Legend of the Holy Notaries. It would, indeed, be strange matter for a *legendum*. It is rather odd, as a constituent of the Alexandrine history; except that this work, like the polemical writings of Athanasius himself, is given to reproducing documents, of friends and foes alike. But if it represents a ninth Section of the ancient history, that section not only recorded the translation of Eudoxius to Constantinople but also the formation of the Anomoean party; and on lines very like those of Theodoret.[25] In that case, the ancient history cannot have been composed earlier than 361. But it reflects in no way the revolution in ecclesiastical affairs accompanied by the execution of the Chamberlain Eusebius that followed the death of Constantius. Between these two considerations we are pinned down to the year 361 for its composition. We may guess it to have been written, in heat and bitterness, by a Paulist who had been forced to leave Constantinople. And the fact that his work soon came to be used by an Alexandrine writer suggests that Alexandria was the place of his exile. We have thus succeeded, at one stroke, in getting behind both the Metaphrast and the 'codex Theodosianus', by discovering the text of a Paulist lament and manifesto composed in 361 by someone with first-hand

[24] Mélanges Cabrières, l.c., pp. 104–5.
[25] H.E., ii, 29.

knowledge of the things about which he wrote. Clearly it is a source for the history of Paul of the highest authority. It will be convenient to refer to it as P, and to its component sections, as defined above, by the symbols P^1, P^2, and so on.

But P, for all that it dates only a decade after Paul's death, is not our earliest source for Paul's history. The oldest document in our hands is the Latin encyclical which the Eastern delegates to Sardica addressed to the Donatists.[26] This we may cite as S, appending the section-numbers in Feder's edition of the historical works of Hilary of Poictiers. S is intensely hostile to Paul, and was written while his stormy career was still in full course.

In Historia Arianorum, Athanasius gives us a thumb-nail sketch of Paul's sufferings.[27] This work, couched in the allusive and tantalizing style characteristic of Athanasian polemics, was composed about the same time as P. It, too, is a primary document for our purpose, and may be cited as A. It is reinforced by a brief passage in De fuga,[28] and was unknown to the authors of the later fragments.

The value of what we find in Socrates and Sozomen about Paul depends principally on the character of their sources.[29] The destruction of the Nicene tradition in Constantinople, which began under Constantius and was continued under Valens, involved all records of church life under Paul. But the Novatian sect, though persecuted, survived, and even gave liturgical asylum to surviving Paulists.[30] When, therefore, we find in Socrates and Sozomen a trilogy of stories relating the rivalry between Paul and Macedonius and the harm it brought to the city, a trilogy marked by a detached and ironical impartiality towards state-church quarrels,

[26] Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, LXV (S. Hilarii Ep. Pictaviensis Opera Pars IV. Edn. A. L. Feder. 1916) 48–78, hereafter cited as Feder. The Paul passages are p. 50 line 18–p. 51 line 8, p. 54 line 24–p. 55 line 25, p. 55 lines 10–11, p. 56 lines 18–22, p. 57 lines 20–23, p. 58 lines 8–11, p. 61 lines 9–30, p. 63 lines 23–27, p. 66 lines 4–11 and 30, p. 67 lines 1–7.

[27] Section 7. P.G., xxv, 701.

[28] Section 3. P.G., xxv, 648D.–649A.

[29] For these in general, see F. Geppert, Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates (1898) and G. Schoo, Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Sozomenos, (1911) respectively iii, 4 in the original, and xi in the new, Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche (Ed. N. Bonwetsch and R. Seeberg).

[30] So Auxanon told Socrates, H.E., ii, 38.

we may attribute its authorship to a Novatian.[31] Both historians apparently had the source-document before them, but both paraphrased and supplemented freely, so that we cannot reconstruct its text, at all, but only gather something of its character and contents. The third of the stories, telling of the ruse by which Paul was removed from Constantinople in 344, assumes the finality of the reverse which Paul then suffered, and its irony requires that assumption. But as Paul returned, in 346, for another five years episcopate, we must conclude that this Novatian squib dates about 345. So far as it is accessible, it is of the first order of authority. It will be convenient to refer to the trilogy as N, and its three members as N^1, N^2 and N^3.

Apart from N, Socrates has three minor sources for Paul. The *συναγωγὴ τῶν συνοδίκων* of Sabinus of Heraclea, to which Sozomen also went direct,[32] may have supplied notice of the synods which replaced Paul by Eusebius of Nicomedia in 338 and 'provided' Macedonius for the see of Constantinople in 342. Socrates, in ii, 13., names the consuls for 342, and adds, without relevance to the context, that Constans brought the Franks to submission. The entry *Franci a Constante perdomiti* stands in the Hieronymian Chronicle, side by side with the Hermogenes riot (the theme of Socrates ii, 13 = N^2), for the same year.[33] It appears, therefore, that Socrates is here combining information from a chronicle [34] with the Novatian writer's narrative. In this Sozomen does not follow suit, merely giving the gist of N^2. We must also conjecture that Socrates and Sozomen had a Western source or sources, representative of the Western bishops' view of

[31] The passages are Socrates ii, 6 (excepting the last sentence) 13 (with the end of 12) and 16 (excepting the last two sentences). P.G., lxvii, 192–3, 208–9, 213–7. Sozomen iii, 3 and part of 4, part of 7, 9 (except the last section) P.G., lxvii, 1037–40, 1049–52, 1056. Socrates ii, 27 and Sozomen iv, 2 and 3, treating of the persecuting tactics of Macedonius, seem also to derive from Novatian sources. A further possible indication of Novatian authorship of the trilogy is the phrase which appears in Socrates, in N^3, *οἵ τε τῆς ὁμοουσίου πίστεως*. Socrates, left to himself, would have said *ἐκκλησιαστικοί*. The author of N is never interested in either Paul or Macedonius, but only in the harm they did to Constantinople.

[32] See P. Batiffol, Byzantinische Zeitschrift t. vii (1898), 265–284.

[33] Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller (hereafter cited as G.C.S.) XVII (i), 235. (Edn. R. Helm. 1913).

[34] O. Seeck, Jahrb. f. klass. Philologie, 1889, Heft 8 und 9., argues that the ancient chronicle in question has survived almost entire, between Socrates and other early chronicles.

their controversy with the East, over the exiled orthodox, and constituting a sort of counterblast to S. It does not seem to have been a document of much historical reliability. A pretended citation of a letter from Constans to Constantius (to which we shall return), and the misdating of the synod of Sardica by five years, appear to form part of its questionable contribution to the Histories of Socrates and Sozomen. On the other hand, it probably provided, through Socrates, ii, 23, our only light on the circumstances of Paul's last return to Constantinople. It is from a similar, or perhaps identical, source, that Theodoret obtained his note on Paul, which he combines with matter from A, in H.E., ii, 5.

The task of anyone who would write a biography of Paul is to take A as framework and interpret its allusions with the help of other sources. Perhaps the first person to make the attempt on these lines was George Cedrenus,[35] with Socrates and Sozomen as his aids. But it deserves now to be repeated with the aid of S, N, and, above all, of P.

One ostensible source, on the other hand, must be dismissed as worthless. This is Gelasius of Cyzicus,[36] according to whom Paul was Lector and Notary, under Alexander as presbyter and legate of Metrophanes, bishop of Byzantium. The story is that they were sent, after the Council of Nicaea, to establish the Nicene doctrine in the Cyclades. Metrophanes, like Pope Sylvester, is supposed to be too aged to go to Nicaea in person,[37] and so sends Alexander and Paul (who correspond to the Roman legates Vito and Victor) to represent him. Then, after the Council, *ὑπογραφαὶ περὶ τῆς πίστεως* are supposed to be distributed by area-representatives to all parts of the world. It is significant of the nature of this Gelasian story that the bishop of Cyzicus is to take action for Asia, the Hellespont, Lydia and Caria, through "his subordinates," the bishops of Smyrna and Troas. This line of invention found an appreciative welcome in Constantinople. Ἡ *πολιτεία Μητροφάνους καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου* in the Bibliotheca of

[35] George Cedrenus, Historiarum Compendium i 528. (C.S.H.B., Edition I. Bekker. 1838) *τῷ κά ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Κωνσταντίου.*

[36] G.C.S. xxviii, 106–137. (Edn. G. Löschcke and M. Heinemann, 1918). H.E. ii, 38.13 merely repeats ii, 28.13, for effect.

[37] H.E., ii, 5.4 (op. cit. 44).

Photius,[38] makes Alexander seventy and Paul twelve, when they go to the Council of Nicaea, which lasts three-and-a-half years. They then tour Thrace and Illyricum, pacifying the churches, and attend the dedication of the new capital-city of Constantinople. Finally, they make an apostolic tour of Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Hellas, and the inland districts, as well as the islands. At the completion of this visitation, Alexander succeeds Metrophanes, who, on his deathbed, designates Alexander and Paul, in succession, to hold the bishopric after him.

What we have here, in short, is pure invention, ministering to the ecclesiastical vanity of Constantinople, and based upon no more knowledge than that of the names of three early bishops.[39]

II. The Early Life of Paul

Our knowledge of the early life of Paul derives entirely from N. In N[3], the Praetorian Prefect Philip, in shipping Paul to Thessalonica, jested that he was returning him to the home of his ancestors. It may be judged, therefore, that it was a well-known fact that Paul was a Thessalonian. Socrates ends the story with a phrase the irony of which suggests that he may have transcribed the actual words of the Novatian author: *ὁ μὲν οὖν Παῦλος, παρὰ προσδοκίαν ἐκβληθεὶς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν ταυτῷ καὶ τῆς πόλεως, ἀπήγετο.* The purpose of the Prefect's manoeuvre was to get Paul out of the see. But the writer calls attention to a second implication of the scheme. Paul was deprived of his citizenship of Constantinople. He was returned to his place of origin, as having proved an "undesirable." So Paul was not born or brought up in Byzantium. He only came thither, as a New-citizen, in 330, when Constantine built the new quarters which turned the ancient town of Byzantium into the capital city of Constantinople. To provide population for his new capital, Constantine offered inducements to people from all the neighbouring cities to migrate. From such a city as Thessalonica there doubtless came a large contingent which filled one portion of the

[38] P.G., civ, 105–120.

[39] This development is treated by Francis Fischer, De patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum catalogis, in Commentationes Philologicae Ienenses, iii (1884) 265–333.

city as a Thessalonian colony. So the new population of Constantinople must have taken on something of the character of "nations" in a medieval university. The numbers involved must, however, have been vastly greater. The Hieronymian Chronicle has an entry, under the year 330, *Dedicatur Constantinopolis, omnium paene urbium nuditate.*[40] This has commonly been taken to refer to the robbing of towns of their statuary and works of art to adorn the streets and public buildings of the Queen-city. But the phrase is, no doubt, deliberately ambiguous. Towns were denuded of living citizens as well as of statues. So Eunapius, in his Lives of the Sophists,[41] speaks of *ὁ μεθύων δῆμος ὃν Κωνσταντῖνος, τὰς ἄλλας χηρώσας πόλεις ἀνθρώπων, εἰς τὸ βυζάντιον μετέστησε.* The language of Eunapius is scornful and unsympathetic, but probably not entirely groundless. It may be untrue that the colonists were the scum of the cities they came from. But such large bodies of uprooted people must have presented something of a problem to the authorities. And outstanding men in the different groups would easily get something of the character of demagogues. At the same time, their place of origin would be a matter of common knowledge in the city. Both these things, it seems, soon befell Paul.

N^1 tells us of his elevation to the bishopric. The problem is to decide what comes from the Novatian source, and what is added by Socrates and Sozomen. Our guide here is the unity of theme running through N. It is that the competition of Paul and Macedonius has been a tragedy for Constantinople. N^1 tells how the two men came to be competitors. It was because the aged Alexander, when asked, in his last days, who should succeed him, gave Paul and Macedonius as alternatives. With the statement of the choice went a characterization of the two candidates. This characterization is given by Socrates in one way, and by Sozomen in another, while Sozomen reports that the Macedonians present it in still another manner. It appears, therefore, that Alexander's oracle upon his successors was a well-known theme in Constantinople, upon which the different parties

[40] Edn. R. Helm, p. 232.

[41] Eunapii Vitae Sophistarum, (2nd) Edn. J. F. Boissonade (1849), 462, lines 45–7.

made their characteristic comments, and that Sozomen reproduces the characterization, balanced and acute, which he found in N[1]. Socrates changes it to suit the view-point of Nicene orthodoxy, which must have Paul white and Macedonius black. Finally Sozomen adds, from his own knowledge, the terms in which the Macedonians make Paul black and Macedonius white. As Socrates paraphrases the story, Alexander says "If you want true goodness, choose Paul. If specious appearance satisfies you, you can take Macedonius." The Macedonian reply was the direct opposite. Macedonius was a promoter of ascetic life, while Paul, though *περὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ λόγους δεινὸς*, was emphatically secular (*Παῦλον δὲ περὶ τρυφὴν καὶ βίον ἀδιάφορον ἐσχολακέναι διαβάλλουσι*). This retort is based, of course, upon an *a posteriori*. The career of Macedonius as a founder of monasteries began long after the oracle of Alexander. It is of interest, however, to gather that even in the Macedonian camp Paul was admitted to have been a man of mark. By comparison with these two party views, the oracle of Alexander, as given by Sozomen, gains in interest. It runs thus:

εἰ μὲν ἀγαθὸν τὰ θεῖα, διδακτικόν τε ἅμα ἐπιζητεῖτε, Παῦλον ἔχετε, εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἔξω πράγματα καὶ τὰς συνουσίας τῶν ἀρχόντων, ἀμείνων Μακεδόνιος.

Here is an apt characterization of the two men, whom Alexander left behind him, as the author of N would say, to trouble the peace of Constantinople; Paul, an orthodox bigot who could never keep on the right side of the secular power, and Macedonius who was only too able to do so. We can feel, confidently, that Sozomen has let us have the original Novatian story of Alexander's oracle. Socrates, in adapting that story, adds to its contrast between the two men a second contrast. He speaks of *Παῦλον τον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* (i.e. by Alexander) *χειροτονηθέντα πρεσβύτερον, ἄνδρα νέον μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν, προβεβηκότα δὲ ταῖς φρεσὶν*, and of *Μακεδόνιον διάκονον τυγχάνοντα μὲν ἤδη πάλαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τῇ ἡλικίᾳ δὲ γέροντα*. This contrast is not drawn in Sozomen, and has no importance for the theme of N. So Socrates supplied it from some source whose historical worth it is difficult to test. That Paul was still young, when made bishop, is confirmed by his ability to bear

physical hardships up to the middle of the century. On the other hand, while it is credible that Macedonius was Paul's senior, it is hardly credible that *γέρων* was an accurate description of him at that time. But some exaggeration in this respect is explicable, for the sake of emphatic contrast. Assuming that Socrates had good historical authority for this passage, the consequences are considerable. If Paul was ordained presbyter by Alexander not long after his arrival at Constantinople, he must have advanced in ecclesiastical qualification before he left Thessalonica. Constantine's provision for the building and endowment of churches for the New-citizens, with church *σιτηρέσια* (as Philostorgius testifies) [42] on the most lavish scale, argues provision for a distinguished clergy to serve the churches. There was thus the prospect of an assured ecclesiastical career before a young Lector, it may be, who chose to accompany the colonists going from his city to the new capital. And this would suggest that Paul had been trained in the household of Alexander of Thessalonica, whom we know as a protagonist, from the first, of the Homoousian cause. The part that Paul played in polemics later, accords very well with the supposition that he was formed in youth in such a school. On the other hand, if Macedonius had been a Byzantine deacon *ἤδη πάλαι* he was not a New-citizen, but a native of Byzantium. As we follow his history, reasons accumulate for believing this to be the fact. And so the competition of the two men becomes the more intelligible, in having, as part of its background, the natural tension arising between the old city and the new colonist population. The imperial palace, whose vast numbers of officials and dependents formed a third component of the yet-to-be-coördinated social life of Constantinople, lay on the slopes running down to the Sea of Marmora from the acropolis of Byzantium.[43] In this way the palace and the old city were natural allies, over against the New-citizens.

[42] H.E., ii, 9. G.C.S. xxi, (Edn. J. Bidez, 1913) 22, lines 2 and 28, with 82, line 2, where Julian transfers *τὰ σιτηρέσια τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῖς τῶν δαιμονίων θεραπευταῖς*. This volume is cited hereafter as Bidez.

[43] The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors, G. Brett, W. J. Macaulay and R. P. K. Stevenson, 1947, reporting the excavations carried out by the Walker Trust, 1935–38. These established the identity of the Great Palace with that begun by Constantine.

It wanted but the addition of a doctrinal and political difference of outlook between the two groups to bring them within sight of civil strife. All this, however, lay in the future. At the time, Paul was elected and consecrated without untoward incident by the bishops who had come together for the purpose in the old cathedral church of Byzantium, the Irene-church or church of Holy Peace,[44] which occupied part of the present site of Aya Sofia, on the side of the old city next the palace. It is possible that Thessalonica paid heed to the career of its scion Paul, since a stone embedded in the wall of a staircase in the basilica of St. Demetrius[45] appears to be the title-stone of a church dedicated to an archbishop of Constantinople. As there was a Paul-church at Constantinople from the time of Theodosius I, so there may have been one also in the city of his birth.

III. The Date of Paul's Consecration

None of our sources indicates the date at which Paul became bishop. But two of them mention an encounter between Athanasius and Paul after the latter had become bishop. S[13] says "Paulus vero Athanasi expositioni interfuit, manuque propriâ sententiam scribens cum ceteris, eum ipse damnavit." Many have supposed that this condemnation of Athanasius in which Paul took part was that at Tyre. But if Paul had been at Tyre we should have expected to find him side by side with Alexander of Thessalonica, and not voting on the other side with the enemies of Athanasius. We ought therefore to consider if there was not some other *expositio Athanasii* (some other "setting out of the case either by or against Athanasius") leading to his condemnation, besides the synod of Tyre. On either interpretation the phrase *expositio Athanasii* is, in itself, hardly appropriate as a description of what happened at that Synod. But we know that a case against Athanasius was set forth, in the presence of Constantine himself,

[44] Socrates, H.E., ii, 6 (end), in which the division between Nicenes and Arians is read back into the times of Alexander.

[45] Archives des Missions Scientifiques, iii, (1876) 256–57. (C. I. G. 8833). L. Duchesne and Ch. Bayet argue that Paul cannot be the person in question because he would have been qualified as martyr. But he is never so qualified, and the title ὁ ὁμολογητής, which he often receives, would come after, and not before, that of archbishop of Constantinople.

at Constantinople, in the autumn of 335, when Athanasius had appealed from the synod of Tyre to the Emperor. Constantine heard Athanasius in the presence of other bishops besides his actual accusers and sentenced him to exile. This, therefore, gives us a suitable solution to the reference in S^{13}. The other reference to an encounter of Paul with Athanasius is the opening sentence of A, which runs,

κατὰ Παύλου, πρόφασις ἐπλάθη, καὶ γὰρ ὁ κατηγορήσας αὐτοῦ Μακεδόνιος, *παρόντων ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν κατηγορίαν, κεκοινώνηκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ πρεσβύτερος ἦν ὑπ' αὐτὸν τὸν* Παῦλον.

This encounter evidently took place after Paul was bishop, for it was at his accession that Macedonius will have made the act of communion, which he followed up by serving as a presbyter under Paul. It is possible that we should understand Paul to have raised Macedonius from deacon to presbyter, though this might have been done by Alexander. The combination of Paul, Macedonius, and a *πρόφασις* to get Eusebius transferred from Nicomedia to Constantinople, points to Constantinople as the place of this encounter. Now Athanasius was in Constantinople on three, and probably only three, occasions. He went thither in the winter of 331–32, to justify himself to Constantine, who was residing in the suburb of Psammathia at that time.[46] But Arius was then alive, and Alexander was therefore still bishop of Constantinople; so this cannot be the occasion of the encounter in question. By the third occasion, when (presumably) Athanasius passed through Constantinople returning from his first exile, the *κατηγορία* had taken effect, in Paul's first exile; so that is too late. And we are thus pinned down to the occasion of the appeal-hearing in November, 335. So the reference of both A and S^{13} is to the same occasion, upon which Athanasius was in Constantinople for eight days. He arrived and waylaid the Emperor on 30 October,[47] who

[46] This visit is recorded in Ap. c. Ar. 60 and 65 and in the Index to the Festal Letters of Athanasius, under the year 330–331. The heading of the Fourth Letter shows that it took place, however, in the following winter. A. Robertson (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, iv, 132, Note 2) in his translation of the works of Athanasius, calls Psammathia a suburb of Nicomedia, following footnote d. on p. 31 of the Festal Epistles of S. Athanasius, Oxford Library of the Fathers, 1854. But George Codinus, De aedificiis Constantinopolitanis (C.S.H.B., Edn. I. Bekker, 1843) p. 109, shows that it was a suburb of Constantinople.

[47] Festal Index, under the year 335–36.

would not, however, listen to his appeal except in the presence of some of those who had been his judges at Tyre. While such persons were being sought, there arrived five Egyptian bishops who had been at Tyre and had signed a protest against the Mareotic Commission.[48] The relations between the Egyptian episcopate and bishop Alexander of Constantinople had been cordial. We can be sure, therefore, that Athanasius and the five would promptly put themselves into touch with Paul. Consequently the scene described in A may have taken place at any time in the week between the arrival of Athanasius and 7 November, when the hearing took place. It is probable that the bringing of the charge against Paul was in some way connected with the appeal-hearing of Athanasius. Since the five Egyptians were permitted to be present, when Constantine heard the appeal, the question must certainly have arisen, at some point, of the bishop of the capital also being present. If, therefore, there were those in Constantinople who looked with disfavor on Paul, here was their opportunity to attack him by raising objections to his admission to the hearing. We have not far to look to find Paul's chief enemy. Athanasius ends the sixth section of his Historia Arianorum by speaking of the pernicious effect on church affairs of court intrigue, by eunuchs and women. Then, in A, he adduces the example of Paul, a victim to such intrigues. So likewise P starts its story of the tragedy of Paul by naming the eunuch chamberlain Eusebius as the chief enemy of the church. The actual *κατηγορία* against Paul was brought by Macedonius, whose personal relations with Paul had been, as Athanasius argues, such as to deprive his attack of much of its force. This is to imply that Paul's real assailants were courtiers. There is no doubt that the Arian interest was already strong in the palace at Constantinople. Socrates,[49] in repeating the story of Rufinus[50] about an Arian presbyter who promoted Arianism in the imperial household, names the chamberlain Eusebius as his first convert, and adds that Arianism was disseminated from the palace into the

[48] Ap. c. Ar., 87, compared with Ap. c. Ar., 78 (end).

[49] H.E., ii, 2.

[50] H.E., x, 12, which speaks of eunuchs but does not name Eusebius (G.C.S., ix(1), 967–8. Edn., E. Schwartz, 1903).

city. The Politeia Metrophanis et Alexandri [51] retails the same story, and follows it up with the words

συνέτρεχον δὲ τῇ προδοσίᾳ Εὐσέβιός τε ὁ δυσσεβὴς πραιπόσιτος, καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς καὶ τῆς δυσσεβείας καὶ τῆς ἀνδρογύνου φύσεως συνθιασῶται.

Philostorgius [52] credits Constantina with action in the Arian interest as early as 325. And it is an implication of the Athanasian story of the death of Arius that Alexander was already experiencing an unsympathetic attitude from the Court. There is every reason, therefore, to suppose that the election of Paul was viewed with disfavor by the powerful eunuch of the palace, and that he promptly began to lay plans for getting rid of him. His way was to find an ecclesiastical charge to bring against Paul, and an ecclesiastic to bring the charge. Macedonius, whose characteristic has been given us as "getting on well with potentates" proved to be his instrument. Athanasius, who could have told us exactly what the *κατηγορία* was, has not done so. But he has told us that, for whatever reason, it failed to accomplish its purpose at this juncture. So Paul was present at the appeal-hearing; and when it ended in a sentence of exile to Trier against Athanasius, the bishops present signed assent to the sentence, and Paul among them.

In this consistent reconstruction of the encounter of Paul with Athanasius we have strong grounds for saying that Paul was already bishop by November 335. Against this, we have the very common assertion that Arius died in 336. But this assertion rests upon the supposition that Arius was present in person at the dedication ceremonies at Jerusalem in September, 335. This supposition is not justified. It is true that nothing would have suited the ideas of Constantine better than that the heresiarch should have been the subject of a spectacular reconciliation with the episcopate, at Jerusalem. Such an event would have formed a crowning ecclesiastical triumph to grace his tricennalia. But for that very reason we can be sure that, if it had happened, it would have been attested in language very different from that which lies before us, which we must now consider. It is all from

[51] P.G., civ,117A. Photius remarks that the Politeia contains much that is useful on the life of Constantine.(105B.)

[52] H.E., i, 9. Bidez, p. 11, lines 1–3.

the pen of Athanasius. He cites a portion of a letter sent by the bishops at the dedication to the churches of Egypt,[53] in which they say that Constantine had written urging them *ἡπλωμένῃ τε καὶ εἰρηναίᾳ ψυχῇ δέξασθαι τοὺς περὶ Ἀρείον*. This phrase could, of course, include Arius. But they do not say that they have examined him or them; only that Constantine certifies to them that *he* examined them and proved them orthodox. In another work[54] Athanasius describes the bishops as *γράφοντες δεῖν δεχθῆναι Ἄρειον καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ*. Certainly, the bishops at Jerusalem, prompted by the Emperor, urged the reconciliation of the churches with the Arian cause. Athanasius adds further that some Arians went with the bishops[55] from Tyre to Jerusalem (*ἀπήγαγον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν τοὺς Ἀρειανοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ*). Certainly there were Arians at Tyre, Ursacius and Valens for example, to say nothing of others whom Athanasius would (less justifiably) have called Arians. And when Eusebius of Caesarea speaks of bishops from Egypt, *Libya*, and the Thebaid being at the dedication,[56] we may perhaps understand a combination of Meletians with Secundus of Ptolemais and his fellows. But Athanasius is not saying that the bishops took these people to Jerusalem for the purpose of their solemn readmission to communion. His argument is that they were all as thick as thieves already at Tyre, and that the synod had used championship of the oppressed Meletians as a cloak for promoting the Arianizing of the church. The publication of the Jerusalem letter is, in his eyes, merely the proof that his suspicions were justified.

What determines the meaning of these ambiguous phrases about "receiving Arius," or "the Arians," is Athanasius' own mind as to the facts about Arius and catholic communion. He wrote his letter to Serapion on the death of Arius[57] just because he learned that people in Egypt had an idea that Arius had been received back into communion. He wrote it to make abundantly clear that no such disaster (to speak from his point of view)

[53] Ap. c. Ar., 84.

[54] De Synodis, 22.

[55] Ap. c. Ar., 84.

[56] Vita Constantini, iv, 43.

[57] Ep. liv., written in 362. The Encyclical to the Bishops of Egypt, 19, written in 356, contains a shorter and more restrained version of the story.

had taken place. He could not so have written had he thought that Arius had in person been received to communion at the dedication assembly in Jerusalem. It would have been no comfort to say "He died before he could receive communion at Constantinople" if the retort was obvious, "But he had communicated, in the church of Macarius, in the Holy City." The most probable interpretation of the facts before us seems to be that Arius was summoned to Constantinople in the spring of 335, preparatory to proceeding via Tyre to Jerusalem, but died at Constantinople. From 330–333, Athanasius had been in the ascendant. In 333, Arius, attempting to claim the Emperor's fulfilment of promises made earlier, brought upon himself the publication in Alexandria [58] of the imperial letter κακὸς ἑρμηνεύς. The next year, however, Athanasius angered Constantine by refusing to meet "the Eusebians" at the Palestinian Caesarea. Constantine determined that Athanasius should meet them at Tyre, and meet them in the rôle of judges. He hoped, no doubt, in this way to bring him to terms and to persuade him to be reconciled with Arius, and finally to receive Arius back into the clerus of Alexandria. So would follow the coveted "reunion all round." The calling of Arius to court in 335 was a preliminary step. When he arrived, Macarius,[59] a presbyter of Athanasius who had made Egypt too hot for himself by over-zealous enforcement of Athanasian discipline, and in particular by his violence towards Ischyras, was in Constantinople as agent for the Alexandrine see. It was he who sent to Athanasius an account of the heresiarch's death under circumstances which the partisans of Nicaea regarded as dramatic and providential. We now have evidence, from a papyrus letter,[60] to show that Macarius was arrested at Constantinople in May, 335, and taken, as a prisoner in irons, to Tyre, to stand his trial. The harshness of these proceedings may indicate the bitterness

[58] The best edition of this letter is that of H. G. Opitz, who prints it as Urkunde 34 in his (G.C.S.) Athanasius Werke, iii, 1 (1935), 69.

[59] C. Hole, in the Dictionary of Christian Biography, gives three persons under the name of Macarius. They are one and the same person, and this creation of three Macarii is simply due to supposition that Arius died in 336.

[60] Harold Idris Bell, Jews and Christians in Egypt (1924), Letter No. 1914, which retails news from about middle May 335, while seeming itself to be written early in July (since the ship of Athanasius lies waiting: he actually sailed on July 11).

of the "Eusebians" over the fact that Arius had died without reconciliation. It is not to be supposed that anything in Athanasius' account of the death of Arius was open to direct refutation. But we may suppose some heightening of the color. The plain fact may be that when Arius reached Constantinople he was a sick man, and that the court sought clinic communion for him. Such a reading of the story would explain why the Eusebians were embittered, and not shamed, as their opponents argue that they ought to be, by the cirmumstances of the death of Arius. On this understanding of the story we may suppose the arrest of Macarius to have followed quickly upon the death of Arius, which we may therefore date in April, 335. It follows that at this date Alexander was still alive. But the story, which Athanasius tells, of his praying that he might die before he was contaminated by the communion of Arius, suggests that Alexander looked upon his own decease as drawing near. The story itself would gain credit, the more, if it were known that Alexander died but a short while after Arius. Now Alexander is commemorated by the Greeks on 30 August, and by the Latins on 28 August, under which date the entry "Constantinopoli depositio Alexandri episcopi" appears in the oldest texts of the Martyrologium Hieronymianum.[61] We can say with assurance, therefore, that Alexander died at the end of August, and that Paul was consecrated in September 335.[62] But that is to say that Paul was consecrated at a time when his metropolitan, Theodore of Heraclea, was away at Tyre, and when several others interested in the see of Constantinople were also there, among whom is to be included Eusebius of Nicomedia. The 19th Canon of Antioch laid down in detail the necessity of the metropolitan of the ἐπαρχία and a majority of his suffragans, agreeing to every election and consecration of a bishop within the province.[63] These Canons of Antioch, long attributed to the Dedication Synod of 341, appear, by the large proportion of the names of the bishops present who figure also in the lists for Nicaea, to come from an assembly much

[61] J. B. de Rossi and L. Duchesne, Martyrologium Hieronymianum, in Acta Sanctorum, Novembris tomus II, p. 112.

[62] No weight attaches to the statement of Socrates, H.E., ii, 5 and 6, that Paul succeeded "about 340."

[63] J. D. Mansi, Sanctorum Conciliorum Collectio, ii (1759), 1316.

nearer 325 than the Dedication synod. The most probable occasion for such a synod is to be sought in the gathering which filled the vacancy at Antioch after the removal of Eustathius. This gathering has long been conventionally dated 330, but it has now been made probable [64] that it took place late in 326 or early in 327. The sixth Canon of Nicaea had already demanded the assent of the metropolitan to every consecration in his eparchy. But just because the rules of consecration were, by 335, so well established, we must suppose that metropolitans going to a distant synod, as in the case of Theodore of Heraclea going to Tyre, would appoint vicars-general to act during their absence. So, when Sozomen [65] adduces a statment of the Macedonians that Paul "made himself bishop" in the absence of his metropolitan or of Eusebius of Nicomedia "who had a right to take part in the consecration," he gives us assurance that Paul was known to have been consecrated in the absence of Theodore and Eusebius, but he does not give us reason for believing that Paul's consecration was irregular. Sozomen himself asserts, in fact that, ὡς δὲ πολὺς ἔχει λόγος, Paul was consecrated by the bishops who were gathered in the city; clearly understanding thereby the regularity of his consecration. There would, indeed, have been no need for the πρόφασις if there had been at hand a clear and public charge giving assurance of Paul's consequent and permanent removal, such as the charge that he had been consecrated in contravention of the canons. We conclude that his consecration was not open to such attack, but that it made a bad start for him that he had been elevated "behind the backs" of the men who now counted for most in the affairs of the Eastern church.

IV. The Trial of Athanasius

Both because it is an important incident in the history of Paul, and because the principles which underly it are those necessary to an understanding of things which happened later to Paul, we must look closely at the trial of Athanasius before Constantine.

The circumstances of his appeal are dramatic. When the pre-

[64] H. Chadwick, Journal of Theological Studies, xlix (1948), 27–35.
[65] H.E., iii, 3.

siding bishops at Tyre obtained the despatch of the Mareotic Commission, Athanasius disappeared,[66] and nothing more was known of him until, on 30 October, he waylaid Constantine, returning from horse-exercise, at the entry to Constantinople. The Index to the Festal Letters of Athanasius says that he escaped from Tyre on a raft. Père Peeters is no doubt right in understanding this to be a lumber-raft, made of Lebanese timber being floated northwards on the coastal current for delivery on the coast of Asia Minor.[67] Athanasius escaped, that is, as a stowaway, and presumably made his way across Asia Minor on foot. His appearance at Constantinople effected a complete surprise. The Emperor could not but grant him a hearing, but determined that it should not take the form of a private audience. Athanasius was kept waiting a week [68] while an urgent letter of summons was sent off, which bore fruit in the arrival of six bishops who had been among the judges of Athanasius at Tyre. The Emperor's idea was evidently not, however, that he should sit alone as arbiter between the arguments of Athanasius and those of his judges. We have already noticed the presence at the hearing of six other bishops besides the protagonists. Sozomen, who leaves out Eusebius of Caesarea and Patrophilus, two out of the six judges named by Athanasius, names Theodore of Heraclea with Maris of Chalcedon as present.[69] Theodore was one of the most obvious persons for Constantine to call, both because the hearing was within his metropolitanate, and because he had been both one of the bishops authorized by Constantine to arrange the synod of Caesarea [70] in 334, and a member of the Mareotic Commission. Since we have thus accounted for fifteen bishops as present at the hearing, it is clear that we cannot exclude the possible presence of other bishops besides, whether suffragans of Theodore from the immediate eparchy, or bishops from further afield who

[66] The synod of Tyre finished on 8 September, after receiving the report of the Commission. Athanasius left Tyre, presumably, before it set out; perhaps therefore early in August. His secret departure may have saved him confinement pending the conclusion of the Commission's work.

[67] Analecta Bollandiana, lxiii (1945), 131–9.

[68] The Festal Index gives ii Athyr as the date of arrival, and x Athyr as the date of the departure of Athanasius for Trier, on the morrow of the trial.

[69] H.E., ii, 28.

[70] Theodoret, H.E., i, 28.

chanced to be in the capital. There was thus something like a judicial hearing by a court of bishops. And if it was thus "Tyre over again," it was with the fundamental difference that it took place in the presence not of a Count but of the Emperor himself, in his character of sacred Autocrat. It was for the bishops to establish, if that were the truth, the guilt of the defendant and its nature. And when that was done, the Emperor would decide what action he should take to protect the body politic from the consequences of the disorder that had been laid bare. The church policy of Constantine during the last twelve years of his life, in dealing with the clergy of the Orient, included a frequent use of this type of dual process. It does not seem to have been applied in the West, and the Western episcopate viewed it very unfavorably, when it was forced upon their attention by its victims from the East.[71] We have still to examine, however, the organic relation of this particular trial to the synod of Tyre, having, as our evidence, the letter of Constantine which brought six of Athanasius' judges to the hearing. Athanasius gives us the text, together with his own comments, and account of the trial.[72] The tone of the letter is petulant, showing the disagreeable impression that had been made upon the Emperor by the sudden appearance of Athanasius as an appellant. It is addressed *τοῖς ἐν Τύρῳ συνελθοῦσιν ἐπισκόποις*. This aorist participle is supported by other verbs in the past tense in the text of the epistle: *τὰ κριθέντα, συνελθόντες ἐποιήσασθε φροντίδα, ἐκρίνατε* and, above all, *πάντες ὅσοι τὴν σύνοδον τὴν ἐν Τύρῳ γενομένην ἀνεπληρώσατε*. Socrates[73] concluded that, while the synod of Tyre was over when the Emperor wrote, it was the same body of bishops that the letter addressed. He supposed them to have been at Jerusalem when the letter arrived, taking part in the dedication. That only eight (or, if we include the Egyptians, thirteen) of these bishops answered the summons seemed to be explained by the assertion of Athanasius that "when Eusebius and his fellows read this letter, being conscious of what they had done, they prevented the rest

[71] Letter of Julius, in Athanasius, Ap. c. Ar., 35.

[72] Letter of Constantine, Ap. c. Ar., 86. Account of the trial, Ap. c. Ar., 9 and 87.

[73] H.E., i, 33–35.

of the bishops from going." [74] Socrates, not unnaturally, found it hard to conceive how the six could stop the others from going, and naïvely suggests that the Emperor's letter so frightened the rank and file that they were fain to betake themselves home.[75] This understanding of Constantine's letter in the light of the comment of Athanasius has some difficult consequences. It makes it necessary to suppose a very long-drawn-out gathering at Jerusalem. Eusebius of Caesarea's account of the dedication gives no such impression.[76] Nicephorus Callistus, at this point in his history, refers to the contemporary observance of 13 September at Jerusalem, as the feast of the dedication of Constantine's church.[77] He mentions the continuation of the celebrations over the octave, as though referring to matters of which he had first-hand knowledge. Now, in general, liturgical custom of this sort is very good evidence for the time of year when the event commemorated actually took place. But 13 September is so close after the conclusion of Tyre that there could hardly have been time for any business to be done by the bishops at Jerusalem unless they all stayed on after the dedication was over. Even in that event, for Socrates to be right in his supposition, the sessions must have continued for a couple of months. This might be considered difficulty enough. But the discovery of the Festal Letters of Athanasius and their Index made a new and greater difficulty still, for acceptance of the supposition of Socrates; by giving an impossibly short time for the calling of the bishops from Jerusalem to Constantinople. However, a few years after that discovery, C. R. Sievers,[78] in the course of an introduction to his edition of the Historia Acephala, produced a series of arguments to shake the credit of the Festal Index as compared with the Acephala. In the course of these, he sided with Socrates, and proposed to correct the Index by reading x Mechir (5 February) instead of x Athyr, as the date of the departure of Athanasius to exile. This would, of course, mean that the appeal-hearing of Athanasius

[74] Ap. c. Ar., 87.

[75] H.E., i, 35.

[76] Vita Constantini, iv, 45.

[77] H.E., viii, 50 (P.G. cxlvi, 200D).

[78] "Athanasii vita acephala." Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie, xxxviii (1868), 98.

took place (at earliest) on the eve of the synod that condemned Marcellus, by which time very many bishops who were at Tyre must have reached Constantinople. Thus the assertion of Athanasius that the six bishops who answered the summons had prevented all the others from coming to the capital is rendered even more preposterous. The truth is that it is not the kind of statement to be taken seriously, and it is a fundamental error to give it decisive force, in reconstructing the course of events. The motive of the assertion is clear. Athanasius hoped for a review of the arguments brought forth at Tyre, confident of being able to refute them. And when he was confronted only by a small group of his adversaries who, moreover, raised an entirely new charge for which he was unprepared, he was cheated of his hope. Characteristically he saw in this a miscarriage of justice, brought about by conspiracy on the part of his foes. Somehow the conspirators made sure that others from Tyre, who would have treated the matter differently, did not answer the summons. The assertion of Athanasius is, in short, a tissue of surmise and inference, and we may set it on one side while we reconsider the letter of Constantine, summoning bishops to Constantinople, on its own merits.

Constantine's letter is addressed to assembled bishops who had formerly been in the synod of Tyre, and taken the lead in its decisions. It does not require that all the synod-members of Tyre should be at this new assembly, or that all the members of this new assembly had been at Tyre. The only thing it requires is that there was an assembly in progress, of which Constantine knew, at which a number of those who took the lead at Tyre were present. If this assembly were two or three days distant from Constantinople, it is unnecessary to tamper with the Festal Index. The week's delay was enough to ensure that the Court of appeal had that representation of the Tyre "bench" that was indispensable. We know, moreover, that the bishops who attended the dedication at Jerusalem had the aid of the imperial posts and shipping to regain their churches, so that even the westernmost could have been home by the end of October, if they left at once. Consequently, no difficulty is presented by the supposition that a synod, attended by the bishops who answered the sum-

mons, was in session somewhere close to the capital at the time in question. And when that has been established, it is unnecessary to carry the argument further, for the purpose of rejecting Socrates' story. But it may be worth while to suggest Nicomedia as the place of the synod. There was certainly a custom, of some antiquity, of holding autumn provincial synods, and the more recent 20th Canon of Antioch actually named a date, 15 October, for this purpose. In 335, if the metropolitan of Bithynia was to be present at such a synod in his province, it would need to be postponed, a little. And it would not be surprising if, when he and his colleague Theognis of Nicaea arrived, they were accompanied by travel-companions, Eusebius of Caesarea on his way to the capital to make his tricennalian oration,[79] accompanied for his part by his colleague Patrophilus, and the two Danubian recruits to the "Eusebian" cause, Valens and Ursacius, with still a long westward journey before them. Of such a session of the Bithynian provincial synod as is thus suggested, Constantine would know, and recognize that it provided what he sought. We should not suppose that the five Egyptians were brought to the trial by this letter of Constantine. Their presence in the capital suggests that there was secret knowledge in Egypt concerning the "disappearance" of Athanasius. But, being there, they were admitted to sit on an impromptu episcopal bench, prophetic in character of what came later to be well-known in Constantinople under the name of *σύνοδος ἐνδήμουσα*.

At the trial, the surprise tactics of the "Eusebians" consisted of covering the findings of Tyre with a new and heavier charge. The Mareotic Commission had picked up gossip in Alexandria to the effect that if anything happened to the bishop Athanasius overseas, Alexandria would retaliate with a dockers' strike that would starve out the imperial capital. So, after all the labor of the bishops at Tyre to bring home a charge of "sedition" or "tyranny" against Athanasius, he was unreservedly given away by the common talk of his own people. Such was, no doubt, the factual basis of the argument of the six. The Egyptian encyclical of 339 claims that if the Emperor had really believed the charge thus insinuated, he would have given sentence of death, and not

[79] Vita Constantini, iv, 46.

of mere relegation.[80] There is reason in this. And the Egyptians present at the trial may have felt it sufficiently to be glad to sign assent to the lesser punishment. Socrates, in paraphrasing Athanasius' account of the trial, represents the "Eusebians" as asserting that the five Egyptian suffragans had heard Athanasius threaten to stop the shipping of corn to Constantinople.[81] What Athanasius says is that his five colleagues can witness to the fact that the "Eusebians" had the effrontery to declare that he had made such a threat. Their witness to that effect was forthcoming in the encyclical of 339. But Socrates is probably so far right that they could not have denied the currency of gossip about stopping the corn. On the other hand, the "Eusebians" could not prove that Athanasius was responsible for it. Under these circumstances the charge to which, as proven, the bishops appended their signatures must have been couched in fairly vague and general terms. It is not surprising if Paul was a signatory. The charge of plotting to cut off the σιτηρέσια from Constantinople was calculated to shock him or at any rate to shock his people. There was the further incentive that his own position in Constantinople was too insecure to invite him to oppose the wish of the Emperor. So S[13] follows up its statement that he signed, *manu propriâ cum ceteris*, with the sneer "et quandiu quisque eorum (the Eastern bishops who took refuge in the West) episcopus fuit, sua judicia confirmavit." The suggestion, in that context, is that Paul signed assent to the condemnation of Athanasius in the vain hope of staving off his own condemnation, but, when condemned himself, repudiated his sentence against Athanasius. We can, perhaps, even make a guess at the form of words to which the bishops appended their signatures. Theodoret says,[82] of Paul, that the Arians accused him ὡς στάσεως ἀρχηγόν· καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ προσθέντες ἅ συκοφαντεῖν εἰώθεσαν τῆς εὐσεβείας τοὺς κήρυκας. So perhaps Athanasius was condemned ὡς στάσεως ἀρχηγόν. His defence,[83] when the charge of stopping the corn was made, was that, being ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος καὶ πένης, what he was supposed to have threatened was a manifest impossibility; Eusebius retorted that Athana-

[80] Ap. c. Ar., 9.
[81] H. E., i, 35.
[82] H. E., ii, 5.
[83] Ap. c. Ar., 9.

sius was πλούσιος καὶ δυνατὸς καὶ ἱκανὸς πρὸς πάντα. And it was, in fact, clearly absurd to talk of a bishop of Alexandria in 335 as ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος. It might be that hitherto στάσις was an offence conceivable only in persons having a standing in the civil order. But a Christian bishop was capable of influencing the civil action of large bodies of people, and in such a way as to endanger the peace. And this constituted a new form of στάσις. The circumstances of such incidents must involve religious considerations, to which the state could not now be indifferent. The routine operation of the civil courts was neither sufficient nor appropriate as a means of dealing with them. And so we see Constantine improvising a mixed court, and dual procedure, to try Athanasius.

But when we have said that Christian στάσις, of religious motive, created a new problem for those to whom was entrusted the common weal, we have only said half. The changes which had brought about this novelty had also given rise to a new Christian political theory, according to which the bishop, so far from being ἰδιώτης ἄνθρωπος, held an important relationship to the body politic. Episcopal στάσις could not, therefore, be viewed simply as the civil offence of a religious person. It could only be viewed as a religious offence. To understand Paul's history from the time of the trial of Athanasius, we must digress, to consider the new Christian political theory that was moulding the action of ecclesiastical leaders.

V. Christian Political Theory

The new political theory arose, in the first instance, from the tacit agreement of the whole church that the conversion of Constantine was an act of God. Until then, Christians, while regarding civil government as part of the providential order in nature, saw it as sadly degraded by human perversity, and "the deception wrought by demons," to wit, paganism. Within society, as thus in thrall to evil powers, the churches preserved their life as colonies of heaven only at the cost of marked aloofness from at least the active process of maintaining the civil order. But, when God chose to make a Christian prince, hope came in sight of a rapid approximation of the civil order to the divine ideal. From this must follow a drawing together of the ecclesiastical

order with the civil. So much was the outcome of general Christian reflection upon the changed character of the state. But we must not underestimate Constantine's own personal contribution to the new political theory. He saw, in the spirit of unity which had successfully held together the scattered Christian congregations, an instrument designed by God for the recovery of the body-politic of the Empire. He expected the bishops to view this task as their proper duty. He thought Christians, as a whole, to be capable of fulfilling the rôle thus assigned to them.[84] He was accordingly discouraged by his encounter with the Donatists, even to the point of seeing in it a sign of divine displeasure towards himself.[85] He took heart again at the hope that God might grant him, as sole Autocrat, the power of healing the broken unity of the church through her ecumenical action.[86] And it was by his attainment of the character of ecumenicity that the new Christian political theory was set off upon its second stage of development. The ecumenicity of the Emperor was something that must affect political theory, even for pagans. Thus Firmicus Maternus,[87] in his (pre-Christian) Mathesis, excepts the ecumenical person of the Autocrat from the range of astrological prediction. The Emperor, by being ecumenical, cannot be controlled by the regional influences of the planets, but is under the direct rule of God. "Solus enim imperator stellarum non subjacet cursibus . . . cum fuerit totius orbis dominus." [88] Everyone knew that there were races of men beyond the boundaries of the Empire, which had long been supposed, in pagan opinion, to be fixed by heavenly decree.[89] But any complication in the concept of the

[84] See Constantine's letter to the Alexandrines, Ap. c. Ar., 61. "Those who have the law of God for their guide, in addition to their natural advantages" should, by their superior understanding, be able to overcome dissensions.

[85] Letter to Aelafius, Optatus, c. Donatistes, i, 22, C.S.E.L. xxvi, (Edn. C. Ziwsa, 1893) 204–16. "contentiones . . . ex quibus forsitan commoveri possit summa Divinitas, non solum contra humanum genus, sed etiam in me ipsum, cujus curae nutu suo coelesti terrena omnia moderanda commisit"

[86] Vita Constantini, ii, 66., where he speaks as if he had conquered Licinius for no other reason than to open the way to an ecclesiastical settlement of the Donatist schism.

[87] He was later, after conversion, an ecclesiastical author.

[88] Mathesis, II, 30, 5. (Edn. W. Kroll and F. Skutsch, 1897–1913) I. 86.

[89] I A. Richmond and R. P. Wright restore the inscription of Hadrian on Tyneside as "imposita necessitate imperii intra fines conservati divino praecepto." Archaeologia Aeliana. 4th Series, xii, 93–120.

ecumenical sovereign which such a consideration might have created for pagans melted away in the minds of Christians at the remembrance that the Gospel would gather all men into unity in Christ. Already some Christians were concluding that the Roman empire had been a providential preparation for such a consummation.[90]

The rule of the Christian Autocrat came to the churches of the East only through the overthrow of Licinius, which figured in the eyes of Oriental Christians as a second act of God. In this experience, and in the sentiment to which it gave rise, the Christians of the West had no share. So there arose a difference of outlook between East and West in political theory, which halted in the West at the point it had reached by the second decade of the century, while, for the East, it now entered upon a new period of development. It is of great consequence that from this moment Constantine resided mainly in the East, had there his chief preoccupations, and finally crowned and symbolized this preference by the foundation of his name-city on the shores of the Bosphorus. It followed naturally that the Emperor occupied the thoughts of bishops in the East in a way that he did not in the West. In particular, the experience of the Eastern episcopate at Nicaea quickened anticipations of an ideal earthly monarchy to be set up by God in the person of His servant Constantine. Eusebius of Caesarea played a most important part in gathering up and giving acceptable expression to the deductions which Christian leaders were making from the new political situation. Mr. G. P. Baker has given vivid appreciation of the epoch-making character of the Tricennalian Oration of Eusebius.[91] And Dr. K. M. Setton has underlined the fact that the Vita Constantini, while it might from one point of view be classed as a sort of continuation of the Historia Ecclesiastica, is, in prime intention, an ideal portrait of the Christian Autocrat, conceived as the Earthly vicegerent of God the Emperor of the Universe.[92] The

[90] ἥ τε Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ εὐσεβὴς διδασκαλία, twin roots of blessing to the world. Eusebius, Tricennalian Oration, Section 16.

[91] Constantine the Great. (London. 1930).

[92] K. M. Setton, The Christian attitude towards the Emperor in the 4th Century, (Columbia University Press, 1941), who calls attention to the views of Firmicus Maternus already mentioned.

fact that Eusebius died with the work unfinished, so that it remained fruitless (until at least the reign of Valens, when it received publication), leaves the Tricennalia Oration as alone influential in the times with which we are concerned. But Eusebius is not to be credited with originality as a political thinker. And when Dr. Setton says that "The Life of Constantine is clearly an effort to convince the Roman world that the time had come for rule by a Christian Emperor" he is in fact attributing such a conviction not to the author of the Life only, but to Eastern bishops generally, not excluding Athanasius.[93]

These political dreams and visions had their immediate consequences for the internal life of the Eastern church, of which illustration is afforded by the Canons of Antioch already mentioned. These were the work of a synod over which Eusebius of Caesarea presided, and came ultimately to take their place in the foundations of Canon law for East and West alike. They must clearly first have met the needs of their own time. An outstanding feature of the collection is the way in which it relates the episcopate to the Emperor in terms of territoriality. Canons 9–25 are all concerned with the eparchy, within which the bishops are to be united under the metropolitan. When the bishops of an eparchy cannot reach agreement, they are to call upon those of a neighboring eparchy to review the issues with them in combined session of the two eparchies, or, if need be, more. Should this fail to bring peace, there remains only recourse, by consent of the eparchy concerned, to the Emperor. He alone has the powers of ecumenicity wherewith to succor the church; as he did, in the words of Canon 1, "at the great and holy synod of Nicaea, held in the august presence of the Emperor Constantine, dear to God." This is not to say that the Emperor can do the work of bishops or that he is infallible. To establish the latter point, Eusebius relates how Constantine, after he had become sole Autocrat, rejected the title μακάριος when it was addressed to him.[94] Nevertheless, the Autocrat, if not infallible, is able, by reason of his ecumenicity, to help the bishops in their need. Eusebius expresses

[93] Setton, op. cit., c.iv, examines the attitude of Athanasius towards the Emperor Constantine and his successors.

[94] Vita Constantini, iv, 48.

his conception of this relationship of the Emperor to the Church in telling what Constantine had done at Nicaea; *τὰ τῆς συνόδου δόγματα κυρῶν ἐπισφραγίζετο*.[95] What is thus silently excluded from consideration is any ecumenical bishop or other purely ecclesiastical final court of appeal. For the Eastern episcopate, at this stage, the character of ecumenicity is realized only in the Emperor.

This makes a subtle change in the character of bishopric, as conceived in the Canons. The bishop is an official. The first concern in making a new bishop is that he shall be integrated into the episcopate of the eparchy. The rights of his subjects, though recognized, are a second consideration. Provision is made for the event that a bishop, duly consecrated, and without canonical offence on his part, may prove unacceptable to the flock for whom he was consecrated. So there comes before us, in these Canons, a new phenomenon, the *ἐπίσκοπος σχολάζων*. And Canon 16 forbids the plebs of a vacant diocese to receive, or receive back, such a person, even though unanimous in desiring it, until the consent of the episcopate of the eparchy has been obtained. Both here and in the oration of Eusebius we notice a coolness to democracy new in the Christian tradition, where, hitherto, the devoted loyalty of his flock had been taken as the surest testimony to a shepherd approved of God. The new anti-democratic feeling of the "Eusebians" throws some light on the proceedings at Tyre. Athanasius had been ruthless in using the civil arm to coerce ecclesiastical minorities in Egypt. Of this fact Bell's Meletian papyri afford eloquent testimony. Yet we hear no word of complaint, at Tyre, that Athanasius had been harsh in taking such constitutional action.[96] It entirely accorded with the new political theory for a bishop to act in this way. Accordingly, the charges preferred at Tyre had entirely to do with oppressive or violent acts committed by persons without civil authority. The Christian plebs, and, still worse, the inferior clergy, were taking upon themselves to use illegal violence in the interests of an ecclesiastical cause. Faced with such charges, Athanasius de-

[95] Vita Constantini, iii, 23.

[96] It appears from the encyclical of the bishops of Egypt (Ap. c. Ar., 5) in 338 that the Eusebians had *begun*, at that time, to lay the acts of magistrates as a charge against Athanasius.

fended himself on lines that constitute an admission on his part that the charges, if substantiated, would be of weight. And when he was unable wholly to rebut the charge, the substance of his defence was that from Nicaea onwards the Emperor was bound to the faith and order of Nicaea, and must therefore look indulgently upon breaches of the peace that might have been committed, in emergency, in promoting Nicene orthodoxy. The Sacred Autocrat must, according to Athanasius, before all things, be Catholic.[97] This was an attitude that caused his opponents the greatest embarrassment, which proceeded, as Athanasius very well perceived, from their doctrinal coolness towards the Nicaeanum. Their only way to counter-attack without exposing themselves was to convince the Emperor that Athanasius did not strive to make his people scrupulous in obedience to their sovereign. In this they succeeded just so far as to gain the relegation of Athanasius to Trier, with the result that the church of the West, with its different outlook on the principles at stake, was drawn into the quarrel. In the upshot, conduct that the East called episcopal tyranny[98] was identified in the West with pastoral zeal and the defence of the liberty of the church. Ecumenical sovereignty had been mediated to the West, from 337 to 350 when Constantius became sole Autocrat, by Emperors who accepted, as keystone of their religious policy, the rôle of guarantors of the spiritual liberties of the church. But as soon as Constantius, moulded to the Eastern theory in its most "Eusebian" form, attained rulership of the whole Roman world, we find Athanasius publicly denounced as a demagogue. This stigmatization finds brutal expression in a letter of Constantius to the people of Alexandria,[99] written in 356, in which Athanasius, who certainly derived from the upper class of Alexandrine society,[100] is dubbed

[97] Thus likewise the Westerns at Sardica write to Constantius that, before considering any ecclesiastical issue, he shall reflect "Catholicus sum." Feder, p. 182, line 12.

[98] See the comment of Eusebius of Caesarea on the behavior of the Egyptians as they entered the synod of Tyre: *εἰ γὰρ ὧδε τυραννεῖτε, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ὑμῶν πατρίδι.* Epiphanius, Panarion, 68.8, G.C.S., xxxvii (Edn. K. Holl, 1931), 149.

[99] Apol. ad Constantium, 30.

[100] Socrates, H.E., iv, 13, speaks of Athanasius hiding for four months *ἐν μνημείῳ πατρῴῳ*, which would imply a family catacomb. In the Festal Index and Historia Acephala we read of a villa, garden or estate on the New River, as a place to which he retired at need.

ἀνὴρ τοῦ πλήθους with every kind of opprobrious epithet attached. The clergy approved by the Emperor, on the other hand, are σεμνότατοι to whom the congregations are told dutifully to unite themselves. In thus attacking Athanasius, Constantius was trampling on the sentiment of the whole Western Church. And this he had reason to know, for, in 342, he had received a letter from the Western episcopate assembled at Sardica claiming that the Christian prince's task is to defend, for the people, a *dulcissima libertas* whereby everyone has *integrum vivendi arbitrium*.[101] This *libertas* is, however, only for Catholics. The Emperor is to take care lest *rectores locorum gravissimis hereticis favorem praestent*. Where Catholics are concerned, the bishops ask that *omnes ubique judices . . . ad quos sola cura et sollicitudo publicorum negotiorum pertinere debet, a religiosâ se observantiâ abstineant, neque . . . putent se causas cognoscere clericorum, et innocentes homines . . . terroribus frangere atque vexare*. The reference in this last phrase is to the Mareotic commission. And it is significant of the difference of view of East and West that "judices," for the Westerns at Sardica, means exclusively civil magistrates, while in S it is applied to the bishops commissioned to try Athanasius at Tyre.[102] We are thus prepared to find that one and the same person could be, for the West, a confessor, and for the East στάσεως ἀρχηγός. And this division of opinion based on difference of political theory tended, as time went on, to be fused with the division in theological doctrine. The key to "Eusebian" theology was the unqualified monarchy of God, so that the fanaticism of Homoousian confessors seemed to "Eusebians" the worst kind of sedition against the divine law.[103] With these facts of church politics in view, we can return profitably to the affairs

[101] Feder p. 181 line 14 — p. 182 line 2.

[102] For the bishops as *judices*, Feder, p. 56 cf. Epiphanius, Panarion 68.8 (ὁ Κωνσταντίνος) ἐκέλευσε δὲ δικάζειν Εὐσέβιον τὸν Καισαρείας καὶ ἄλλους τινάς. Likewise Athanasius is defendant (Εὐσέβιον καθεζόμενον καὶ δικάζοντα καὶ 'Αθανάσιον ἑστώτα. So Rufinus, H.E.,x,18 speaks of the woman who slandered Athanasius at Tyre: *conversa ad judices obtestari fidem dei coepit vera se dicere*.

[103] There still remained for Easterns as well as Westerns a line of demarcation between dogma and law, which tended to be blurred by Constantius, and was reaffirmed by Leontius, bishop of Tripolis in Lydia, as related of him by Suidas, in the words addressed to Constantius, θαυμάζω ὅτι εἰς ἕτερα διέπειν ταχθεὶς ἑτέροις ἐπιχειρεῖς. Suidae Lexicon, Edn. A. Adler, III (1933) 246.

of Paul, and appreciate the ecclesiastical grounds of the charge and prosecution that brought about his first exile.

VI. Paul's First and Second Exiles

It is typical of the polemical style of Athanasius that assertions which he makes in a way which sounds convincingly favorable to his cause, need but a little modification to make them tell as convincingly for the other side. He points to facts and invites the reader to accept his conclusion, but if the reader pauses to consider he may find reason to dissent. Thus Athanasius tells us that Macedonius had communicated with Paul as bishop, and was serving as a presbyter under him, when he made his accusation. The conclusion he invites us to draw is that the charge cannot have been brought with any conviction. But the inference might just as well be that Paul had recently committed some outrage on Macedonius and his associates, in spite of the fact that Macedonius had given him dutiful submission. According to N^1, *οἱ δὲ ἀρειανίζοντες Μακεδόνιον ἔσπευδον*. That argues the partiality of Macedonius towards persons to whom Paul was opposed. Paul's offence may have been to lay violent hands on some of them. And as, in the upshot, Paul was sent by Constantine into exile, without any steps being taken to fill his throne, his offence cannot have been explicitly doctrinal. His doctrinal position was obnoxious to a party in the palace, but his condemnation was sought by the same course as that which had resulted in the exile of Athanasius. It was only some three months after the first raising of the charge that it succeeded. And whereas A would suggest that the original charge against Paul fell into the oblivion it deserved before being revived to serve another purpose, it seems that the charge once made was never allowed to sleep at all. The opportunity to obtain an episcopal sentence that would implement an imperial decree of banishment presented itself in February, 336, when there began at Constantinople a synod representative of Asia Minor and the Balkans [104] whose main achievement was the condemnation of Marcellus of Ancyra for heresy. To this synod came Protogenes from Sardica, and Cyriacus from Naissus. And S^3 tells us, "Protogenes, apud acta anathematizans

[104] Eusebius, Contra Marcellum, ii, 4. (end), P. G., xxiv, 821D.

Marcellum et Paulum, postea eos in communionem suscepit." S[20] adds that Gaudentius of Naissus, successor to Cyriacus, is involved in a like inconsistency, in communicating with Paul. S nowhere accuses Paul of taking a share in the condemnation of Marcellus. It is thus clear that Paul was not allowed to sit as a member of the February synod, as he had been allowed to sit in the court that tried Athanasius. On the contrary, he was tried by this synod, not for heresy, like Marcellus, but for the original charge; according to Theodoret ὡς στάσεως ἀρχηγόν. His sentence was in the acts of the synod. But the Sardican letter must exaggerate when it speaks of the entry as an anathema. It is inconceivable that Protogenes supposed himself implicated in an unconditional excommunication of Paul. The charge, in whatever way it was worded, will no doubt have been recorded in the acts, as having been found true and just. And in this way the synod against Marcellus will, as regards Paul, have fulfilled the functions of a mixed court, like that which tried Athanasius. It is not inconceivable that in both cases the sentenced bishop was laid under conditional anathema, should he despise correction, since the Eastern bishops were evidently reacting with great sensitiveness on the subject of episcopal behavior towards the Emperor. They wrote to Constantine accusing Marcellus of *lèse majesté*, by refusal to take part in the dedication ceremonies at Jerusalem.[105] And Eusebius of Caesarea affixes a like charge on the ground of insulting flattery of the Emperor contained in a book of Marcellus.[106] But the action of the synod, with regard to Marcellus, was synodical action against a heretic in the traditional form. Marcellus was deposed and excommunicated, and betook himself to Rome. Paul, on the other hand, was not free to do likewise, but departed to his assigned place of relegation in Pontus. He had been there some fifteen months when Constantine died. The embalmed body of the city-Founder was brought to Constantinople to be entombed, in the newly-finished church of the Holy Apostles in the centre of the new city and but a short distance inside the land-wall. Here, the religious rites were conducted by

[105] Sozomen, H. E., ii, 33.

[106] Contra Marcellum, ii, 4., P.G.xxiv.824B, arguing that it aimed at getting the Emperor on his side against the orthodox bishops.

οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ λειτουργοὶ,[107] who seem to answer to οἱ τὰ νόμιμα τελοῦντες at the Emperor's so-recent baptism.[108] In neither case were the ministrants defined by local ecclesiastical office. No doubt the Nicomedian bishop Eusebius was foremost on both occasions. His translation to the bishop's throne of Constantinople may have been already in prospect. According to Cedrenus,[109] who seems to have drawn his information from Philostorgius, Eusebius had placed Constantine's will in the hands of Constantius, for which service his translation to Constantinople was to be the recompense. Accordingly Philostorgius (who ignores Paul) makes Eusebius the direct successor of Alexander.[110] Theodoret does the same, led thereto, no doubt, by the episcopal list which he gives at the end of his History; [111] a list whose commencement may go back to the Macedonian days in Constantinople.[112] But whatever was in promise or prospect, Eusebius was not translated at this time. One reason may be that the imperial will, when opened, was found to contain a provision that Constantinople should pass to the Founder's homonymous son.[113] The Paschal Chronicle [114] contains the entry ὁ μὲν νέος Κωνσταντῖνος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἔτος ά. Schwartz calls this a "worthless note." [115] But there is no intrinsic improbability in the attribution to Constantine Junior of a special right to his father's name-city. Le Nain de Tillemont took quite a different view of the entry in the Chronicle from that taken by Schwartz.[116] There is numismatic evidence that Constantine Junior made claims of

[107] Eusebius, Vita Constantini, iv, 70 and 71.

[108] Op. cit., iv, 62.

[109] George Cedrenus, Historiarum Compendium (C.S.H.B. Edn. I. Bekker, 1838). I, 520.

[110] H.E., ii, 10. Bidez, p. 22.

[111] H.E., i, 19.

[112] The Chronographia of Theophanes, in recording the baptism of Constantine, calls Eusebius bishop of Constantinople. This is in conflict with the entry of a three-year episcopate of Paul, which appears under 335. It suggests use of a succession list begun before 381.

[113] Constantine Junior, though born out of wedlock, was apparently his father's favorite, and had been treated all along as eldest son.

[114] Chronicon Paschale, (C.S.H.B. Edn. L. Dindorf, 1832) I, 534. The Annals of Eutychius of Alexandria are not such as to contribute to accurate history. But in recording the partition of the Empire, they make Constantine reign in Constantinople, Constantius in Antioch, and Constans in Rome.

[115] Schwartz, l.c., p. 472, Note 1.

[116] Histoire des Empereurs, iv (1704), 317 and (Note 2) 666.

sovereignty over the Empire beyond the third of it of which he was unquestioned ruler.[117] His letter to the Alexandrine church announcing the return of Athanasius is indicative of such a claim. Also, the phrase of Rufinus,[118] *Constantius orientis regnum solus obtinuit Constantino fratre . . . interfecto*, suggests that while Constantine lived he made claims which limited the rights of Constantius.

The entry in the Chronicle goes on to say that Constans reigned 12 years in Rome, and Constantius 12 years in Rome after that. But given an original entry of Constantine's one year sovereignty in Constantinople, there is nothing surprising in such an addition. Professor Norman Baynes, while giving no weight to the Chronicle entry, argues that it was some time before Constantius began to exercise sovereignty in Constantinople.[119] The Vita S. Artemii contains the statement,[120]

ὁ δὲ Κωνστάντιος, ὁ δεύτερος τῶν Κωνσταντίνου υἱῶν, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς εὠας τότε πραγμάτων πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας ἀγωνιζόμενος, τὸ τῆς εὠας ἀσπάζεται μέρος· καὶ τότε βιζάντιον μετονομασθὲν εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν καὶ νέαν Ῥώμην, ποιεῖται βασίλειον.

This work, which contains much that was drawn from Philostorgius, seems to have sought its historical information from some composite history constructed from good sources. In the sentence quoted a space of time is clearly interposed between the entry of Constantius upon his rule over the Orient and his taking Constantinople for Residence. Professor Baynes thought that this might be due to voluntary abstention. "Constantius was perhaps unwilling to demand for himself a capital in which his kinsmen had been so recently murdered: his self-denial should prove his innocence." The question remains: Who, then, ruled in Constantinople? To this Baynes replies, Constans, to whom fell the territory of the Caesar Dalmatius, when he was assassinated somewhat later than the brothers of Constantine. This answer, to be satisfying, requires that the Queen-city should go with the possession of Thrace, which is not, at least, self-evident. So,

[117] O. Seeck, Zeitschrift für Numismatik, xvii, 39 ff.
[118] H.E., x, 16.
[119] Cambridge Medieval History, I, 56.
[120] A. Mai, Spicilegium Romanum, iv, 346.

whether the Paschal Chronicle is to be trusted or not, Constantinople clearly did not pass straight into the possession of Constantius at the time of his father's funeral. It was so much the easier in consequence for Paul, returning from exile under the amnesty declared by Constantine Junior, to recover his see. If the city passed legally under the authority of Constantine, it is likely enough that the church of Constantinople received from him just such a letter as he sent to Alexandria, announcing to it the return of its exiled bishop. But whether or not those were the circumstances of Paul's return, he clearly thought that the tables were now turned on his enemies. Some of them experienced the weight of his hand. So S^9 complains "De Paulo Constantinopolitanae civitatis quondam episcopo post reditum exilii sui, si quis audierit, perhorrescet." At this point a whole section has fallen out of the text,[121] and no doubt gave details of Paul's "horrid" conduct. Then follows (and survives) the story of what happened when Marcellus returned to Ancyra. The details were probably the same in both stories, and indicate retaliation on church dependants who were judged to have failed in loyalty to their absent bishop. But it was a short-lived triumph in either case. The military risings, and the assassinations that took place in the summer of 337, rendered a great part of Constantine's will inoperative. The three sons of Constantine were proclaimed Augusti on September 9, 337, and in June 338 they met at Viminacium.[122] There they agreed on the apportionment of world power between themselves, and coinage was minted to celebrate the *concordia imperatorum*. This agreement, replacing Constantine's will, no doubt transferred to Constantius the unrealistic sovereignty of his brother in Constantinople. Thus the city was brought into union with Asia, and not with Europe. And by that change Paul's fate was sealed.

The brothers' agreement contained ecclesiastical clauses. One of these concerned the restoration of Athanasius, who, instead of returning instantly to his see like Paul, accompanied Constantine

[121] A. L. Feder, Studien zu Hilarius von Poictiers, in Sitzungsberichte d. Kgl. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, clxii (1910) Pt. 4, p. 184.

[122] See the chronological argument of Professor N. H. Baynes in the Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, xii (1925), pp. 65–9. The Theodosian Code shows Constantine Junior in Pannonia on 12 June.

to Viminacium,[123] to be formally placed under the protection of Constantius. The result was that, as he made his way back to Egypt overland, he interpreted his restoration by the imperial brothers as giving him authority to reverse the decisions of "Eusebian" synods all along his way and to restore the fortunes of Nicene orthodoxy. S[8] gives a blood-curdling account of his doings. Meanwhile Constantius, still too pressed by military necessities to be able to enjoy possession of the palace at Constantinople, hastened from Viminacium to Caesarea in Cappadocia, headquarters for the campaign in the interests of Christian Armenia which his father had opened against the Persians not long before his death. Hannibalian, prorex of Roman Armenia, who should have maintained the Roman warfare, had been among the victims of assassination, and Constantius had to obtain a grasp upon a disordered army.[124] It is probable that during the summer of 338 Athanasius passed through Constantinople. If the Paulists were encouraged thereby, they must in the end have paid dearly for their association with the Nicene leader. From Constantinople he went forward to the Cappadocian Caesarea, where he had an interview with Constantius.[125] But a rising wave of resentment must have followed in his wake. And when, at length, Constantius found leisure to take possession of the Great Palace, all the feeling aroused by Athanasius must have vented itself on Paul. This was probably in the autumn [126] of 338. In the eyes of the Eastern bishops, Paul, by his contumacious return, had, under the 16th Canon of Antioch, forfeited all right to retrial, and was bishop of Constantinople no more. So he was declared deposed by a local synod which met in the capital, and Eusebius was translated from Nicomedia to be bishop in his place.[127] For this information we are probably indebted to

[123] Apol. ad Constantium, 5.

[124] The plight of Constantius at this juncture, with Armenians deserting him and Roman discipline broken, is described by Julian, Or. 1. 20.

[125] Apol. ad. Constantium, 5.

[126] We know from Ap. c. Ar., 6 that the translation of Eusebius was news in Egypt at the close of 338 or early in 339.

[127] See Socrates H.E., ii, 7. It is possible that the same synod consecrated Gregory to replace Athanasius; Philostorgius, H.E., ii, 11. (Bidez, p. 24) records this as the work of a synod other than Tyre, called by the Emperor's leave. The Festal Index records Gregory's entry into Alexandria as bishop in March 339.

Sabinus. It was now the turn of the palace to triumph. Our surmise that Paul had received encouragement from Constantine Junior may find corroboration in the fact that Paul betook himself straightway to Trier. Maximin, bishop of Trier is blamed, in S[27], for being the first Western bishop to communicate with Paul. This, it says, was at a time when Paul was "nefarius et perditus," a man ecclesiastically ruined by his crimes. For ecclesiastics arriving from the East, Maximin was the door to audience by the Western sovereign. He therefore earned a peculiar hatred from the "Eusebians" by his discriminations. Paul no doubt had audience with Constantine, and then made his way to Rome to Pope Julius. His travels filled 339 and 340, and enabled him to gain the sympathy of many Western bishops. S[11] complains of the success of the Eastern fugitives in this respect, "circumeuntes simul exteras regiones . . . persuadebant judicibus non esse credendum illis qui in eos digne sententiam protulerunt, ut hoc genere commercii sibi quondam ad episcopatus reditum procurarent." If Paul had always been at heart a Western, these two years must have confirmed his leanings. Neither he nor anyone in the West is likely to have recognized any canon on the rights of metropolitans besides the 6th Canon of Nicaea. No 20th Canon of Antioch, for them, conditioned Paul's right to return to his see so soon as the imperial sentence of exile was removed from him. And so Paul was among the company on whose behalf Julius sent to Antioch two presbyters and a letter in the hand of a Count of the Empire, calling on the Eastern bishops to come to a synod in Rome in the spring of 341 at which the appeal of all the fugitives should be heard. During the winter of 340–341, Eusebius of Constantinople was with Constantius at Antioch, and holding the presbyters of Julius waiting for an answer. When these were released to return, in January 341, they carried a refusal that constituted the first breach between the sees of Old and New Rome. Julius now held synod, without the Easterns, about March, and despatched a letter [128] to Eusebius and his companions announcing the decisions of the synod. The letter does not name Paul, but it does mention "bishops from Thrace" (in whom we may see Lucius of Adrianople, and Paul, as objects of

[128] The text is in Ap. c. Ar., 20–35.

the allusion) amongst the appellants [129] "against whom no charge had been received." In the absence of either charge or accusers, the synod acquitted all the appellants of ecclesiastical offence and proclaimed their right to reinstatement in their sees. Before the winter came again, the bishop Eusebius was dead, and there was no rival sitting upon Paul's throne at Constantinople to hinder his return.

VII. Civil War in Constantinople

On the news of Eusebius' death, Paul returned to Constantinople, accompanied by the refugee bishop of Gaza, Asclepas, who, like himself, had been vindicated by the Roman synod.[130] Asclepas may have been sent as a commissioner of the synod, to promote and witness Paul's reinstatement. The Paulist interest must have been well led in the days of Eusebius, who was, of course, largely an absentee during his short tenure of the see of Constantinople, and Paul received a popular welcome home that secured for him the possession of the churches. It is in the light of so resounding a defeat for the Eusebian cause in the capital that we can understand the statement, in P_2, that the metropolitan, Theodore of Heraclea, with some other leading Eusebians recently returned from the Dedication synod at Antioch, came to Constantinople and made Paul an offer of peace. This he rejected out of hand. The rebuff left them, for the moment, with nothing that they could do except "provide for" the church of Constantinople against better days. So they met (we may conjecture in the palace, though Socrates says in the church called Paul), and nominated Macedonius, whom we may suppose to have been a leading "collaborator" under Eusebius, to be his successor.[131] Socrates, with the text of Sabinus before him, was puzzled that this author should omit to describe the consecration of his party leader, and could only attribute his silence to the worst motives.[132] But as the nominating bishops, to judge from what ensued, had no church in which to gather the plebs, we may

[129] Ap. c. Ar., 33.

[130] Ap. c. Ar., 47 shows Asclepas laying before the synod of Sardica documentary evidence of his right to his bishopric.

[131] Socrates, H.E., ii, 12, whose list of bishops agrees with that in P^2.

[132] H.E., ii, 15 (end).

attribute the silence of Sabinus to the fact that no consecration took place at this time, and that Macedonius remained no more than bishop-designate. This understanding of the facts removes difficulties in the interpretation of the story at a later stage.[133] But it was just this circumstance that made it so urgent a necessity for the imperial Chamberlain to get Paul out of Constantinople by whatever means. And when the early spring of 342 brought the news that Constans was pressing his brother to send Eastern bishops to meet their brethren of the West in synod, it must have occurred to him that this synod would at least serve to get Paul out of the city. This fact was realized so forcibly by the author of P that he accuses the Chamberlain of engineering Sardica for no other end. In this, his view-point is laughably parochial. But as reproduced by the Alexandrine historian it becomes preposterous. For he confuses the Chamberlain with the famous bishop just deceased, associates with him the group of bishops who sought peace with Paul, and so reaches the result that Sardica came about as nothing else than a conspiracy of the Eastern leaders to destroy Paul. In his case some excuse may be urged, for so topsy-turvy a view, in the saying of Athanasius that the Orientals had brought Sardica upon themselves by their machinations.[134] Paul and Asclepas presently received their summons to Sardica. Asclepas went but Paul did not.[135] His excuse was that his people, fearing a plot, would not suffer him to leave the city. We may perhaps see in this excuse the original source of the canard about the conspiracy of the Eastern bishops to obtain the synod of Sardica. If the statement that Paul refused to go did not stand in the original text of P^2, we must suppose the hagiographer and Theodoret to have got it independently from some Western source. But the greater probability seems to be that it did stand in P^2, but has fallen out of the 'Theodosian' text,

[133] Thus S, while attacking Paul with violence, says no word of Macedonius as rightful bishop.

[134] Ap. ad Const., 36. *πάλιν ἠναισχύντουν οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον τάς τε ἐκκλησίας ἐτάραττον καὶ πολλοῖς ἐπεβούλευον.* Hence the West had to take fresh action. Schwartz, without knowledge of P, guessed that the Eusebius in *Tunc temporis* was the Chamberlain, arguing that there was no ground for the Eusebian plot against Paul till after the party-leader's death. (Schwartz. loc. cit., page 516, Note 1.)

[135] See Appendix, "Date of Sardica."

either through negligence on the part of the Latin versionist, or because omitted by the Alexandrine historian. Paul's refusal to leave Constantinople seems to have driven the Chamberlain to desperation. When S^{20} tells us that the Paulists "altaria ipsa humano sanguine coinquinaverunt" and that there were "extinctiones gentilium" and "interfectiones fratrum," we may understand troops to be the *gentiles*, and members of the Macedonian party to be the *fratres*. And so we are led to the supposition that the Chamberlain sent soldiers to secure a Church for Macedonius, only to find it defended with fanatical courage and obstinacy by the Paulists. The news of these doings overtook the Eastern bishops as they drew near to Sardica, so that S, at this point, takes on the character of "stop-press." The indignant bishops represent the Paulists as wholly to blame, so that the blood of the slain at Constantinople lies on the heads of all in the West who have had any fellowship with Paul, and, above all, on the head of Asclepas, whose encouragement had rendered the Paulists so desperate.[136] We may read between these lines that the defenders of the churches had carried off the honors of the fight. And with this supposition agrees the fact that word was sent off to Antioch by the Chamberlain that the forces in the city were insufficient to maintain imperial authority. The result was that Constantius sent an order to the Magister Equitum, Hermogenes, who was leading a force of cavalry into Thrace, to visit Constantinople and lend the authorities there the help required to get the populace in hand again. We can assume that the messages to Constantius and to the Oriental bishops were both sent off on the morrow of the battle for the church. The arrival of Hermogenes at Constantinople should therefore be in the order of a month after the opening of the synod at Sardica. The synod is recorded in the Festal Index, under the Chronicle to accompany the letter for Easter 343, so that if it fell in 342, it must have been later than 29 August, the beginning of the Egyptian year. Early September is a probable time for the opening of the synod and the withdrawal of the Orientals. The business accomplished by the Westerns would suggest that they sat well into October.

[136] Feder, p. 61, lines 23–30, for Maximin; p. 72 for Asclepas, and p. 51 for five other Western leaders.

But they ended without showing any knowledge that Paul was in trouble.[137] We may conjecture, therefore, that it was just about the time that the synod was ending when worse things began in Constantinople than any described [138] in S. To the previously-known sources of information [139] on these happenings P^3 is now an addition of some importance. In spite of minor disagreements, our sources give us an assured general picture. Hermogenes picketed his horsemen before the land-wall, and trusting to the display of force to quell the mob, entered the city with no more than a personal escort and established headquarters in a house, within the walls. According to N^2, insurgents set fire to this house, presumably at night. This gives just the circumstances of confusion and obscurity to explain, what P agrees with N in stating, that the mob recognized Hermogenes and dragged him away before his men could rescue him. In Socrates, Hermogenes is dragged through the streets and then done to death. Sozomen seems to give rein to his fancy when he reverses the order; the mob kills Hermogenes, and then, having tied a rope around his legs, drags the corpse in triumph through the streets.[140] Later writers add further embroideries, as that the corpse was finally thrown into the sea. But the ironical picture of a cavalry general helpless in

[137] Schwartz, l.c., p. 476, suggests that they knew of the Hermogenes riot, which he supposed to have taken place very early (say January) in 342, and that they did not mention him, because his cause was beyond recovery. Against this is their subsequent support of Paul.

[138] The article, Hermogenes, in Pauly-Wissowa, by Schwartz, says that the Hermogenes incident took place early in the year. The sole ground for this seems to be a conjecture that the force commanded by Hermogenes was being sent from Antioch to reinforce the Danubian army. There is no evidence to show this, and as it was mid-winter when Constantius arrived to avenge Hermogenes, the riot must have been in the autumn.

[139] N^2, represented in Socrates, H.E., ii, 13 and Sozomen H.E., iii, 7.; (Socrates also draws upon a chronicle which names the consuls for 342, and records the victory of Constans over the Franks) Ammianus Marcellinus, mentioning Herculanus, son of Hermogenes, in Rerum Gestarum, xiv, 10, where he makes brief reference to the death of the father, described at length in one of the lost books; Libanius, who was himself present in Constantinople at the time of the riot, and describes his personal experiences in Or. i, 44, and the action of Constantius in Or. lix, 94; and the Hieronymian Chronicle (Edn. R. Helm, p. 235) where we have the entry for 342, *Hermogenes magister militiae Constantinopoli tractus a populo ob episcopum Paulum, quem regis imperio et arianorum factione pellebat.*

[140] Socrates, *ἐμπίπρησι μὲν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκιὰν δὲ σύραντες ἀπέκτειναν.* P, *ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι συνέσχον τὸν κόμητα Ἑρμογένην καὶ σύραντες αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πόλεως ἀπέκτειναν.* We may suspect that *διὰ τῆς πόλεως* stood in the text of N after *σύραντες*, and that this provided the incentive for Sozomen's embroidery.

darkling city streets is thoroughly in the style of N, which can here be taken as our closest and most accurate witness. The most remarkable thing about the comparison of sources is that the Christian sources, with one consent, describe the riot as the resistance of the Christian plebs to a threatened removal of their bishop, while the pagan sources treat the whole thing as mob-madness pure and simple, and ignore the religious motive of the rising altogether. So Ammianus describes Hermogenes as "apud Constantinopolim popularium turbela discerptus," while Libanius speaks of the occasion as ἡ τοῦ δήμου μανία, without mentioning the Christians as such, for good or ill.[141] P[3], on the other hand, by its λιθοβολοῦντες, makes the murder strangely deliberate, and treats it as acknowledged Paulist retaliation. Sozomen thought that the charge on which the Holy Notaries had been executed, ten years after this, was that of having organized the rising in which Hermogenes was slain.[142] So also P[3], in unexpected agreement with Libanius, records the fact that the proconsul deserted his post and fled to Heraclea.[143] For P to mention this is to boast successful resistance to imperial authority. So it would appear that the incident had two different appearances, according to the knowledge of the observer. No doubt there was a general insurrection. The city mob could easily read the weakness of the city government in the outcome of the battle for the church, and so be emboldened to kick over the traces. But in view of the Christian evidence we must conclude that the general mob-rising cloaked a deliberate Paulist plot to remove the new threat to Paul's episcopate. The frank admission of this by P shows up the religious fanaticism of the times. After the death of Hermogenes, the leaderless cavalry, unable to effect anything on a walled city whose gates were now closed against them, went their way. The Senate of Constantinople, acting in the part of a popular

[141] This may be deliberate abstention. In Or. lix he refers to arguments by Senators, refuted by Constantius, which may well have involved the question of Paul.

[142] H.E. iv, 3.

[143] Wounded, according to Libanius. P[3], calling the proconsul ὁ ἔπαρχος τῆς πόλεως, the equivalent of Praefectus urbis, is mildly anachronistic, since the Prefecture only dates from 359. The anachronism may be due to substitution, by the hagiographer, of the title familiar to him, for ὁ ἄρχων in the text of P.

government, restored a degree of order.[144] The palace must have remained in a state of siege. It had access to the sea, however, and so was able to send off an appeal for help to Constantius. This reached him as the approach of winter slacked the urgency of war in the field, following an autumn that had brought him a measure of success, as his bishops returning from Sardica were careful to publish, and as Libanius notes. Constantius now collected an army adequate for the recovery of his capital and crossed Asia Minor by forced marches. The mist of a winter morning lying on the Bosphorus suddenly disgorged imperial troops, and the city capitulated without resisting. Libanius describes the able way in which Constantius put Constantinople to rights, but mentions the Christians and their bishop not at all. The Christian writers, on the other hand, know of no settlement but the ecclesiastical.[145] Macedonius was reprimanded for allowing himself to be the occasion of a breach of the peace, and it is implied that he should have awaited vindication of his election by the Emperor, without playing the party-leader. And while Paul was expelled, the churches were left in the hands of the Paulists. This settlement is so far removed from what the Chamberlain can have wished or expected that we must suppose Constantius to have discovered evidence that religion had been the torch that set Constantinople afire, and recognized that fanaticism, aided from the West, might rekindle if made the object of attack. He thus postponed any other interference than the removal of Paul. But it seems that his manner of carrying out this was exemplary. At some stage, A says, Paul was taken in chains to Singara. This must mean as a convict, sent to do forced labor in fortifications on the Persian front. The morrow of the Hermogenes riot is the one point in Paul's history when this seems conceivable.[146] The fact that the Constantinopolitan sources say not a word of it may be but further indication that the Paulists recognized their responsibility for the riot, and so for the consequent humiliating experience of their bishop. None of our sources tells of any sentences to penal servitude having followed the

[144] Libanius, Or. lix.

[145] For example, Sozomen does not even mention the σιτηρέσια.

[146] This was first argued by De Valois in his note to Socrates, H.E., ii, 15.

Emperor's visitation. But it is inconceivable that Constantius can have failed to find ringleaders or scapegoats to whom to apply exemplary punishment, as a warning to the mob. On the other hand, if any were sent to penal servitude, and Paul relegated to a place of exile, it would be like Athanasius to conclude that Paul had gone in chains to Singara. Socrates, to whom A was unknown, supposed that Paul had gone to Rome. Before we leave the subject of the Hermogenes-riot, some attention is due to the possibility of political motives, as apart from ecclesiastical, having something to do with the general character of the disturbance. In view of the abject submission of the city on the arrival of Constantius, we cannot suppose that the Constantinopolitans had had any thought of freeing themselves from his rule. But it is possible that the populace, and especially the New-citizen element, had hoped for the annexation of the city by Constans. The leanings of the Balkans were towards union with Italy and the West, and not with Asia. The Balkans had, in 337, fallen to the share of Constans, and were in fact ceded to Constantius by the secret understanding between the brothers during their united opposition to their half-brother Constantine in 340. There was perhaps ground for the idea that Constans might now support a revolt against Constantius. We know that a demonstration took place against the returning Eastern bishops as they passed through Adrianople from Sardica, and that Constantius took so serious a view of it as to execute ten arsenal-workers convicted of responsibility.[147] Already the principle "cujus regio, ejus religio," is in evidence; and may explain the relation of the Christian share in the rising against Hermogenes to the general insurrection. But any hopes there may have been that Constans would go back on his bargain with his brother were disappointed.[148]

VIII. The Prefect Philip

If Paul left Constantinople in chains, many reasons counselled their removal before long. The course of events in 343 was

[147] Athanasius, Hist. Ar., 18.

[148] This lends point to the address of Libanius' 59th oration, on the Persian war, to *Constans* and Constantius.

towards further yielding on the part of Constantius to the ecclesiastical will of the West, in the eyes of which the person of Paul was sacred. It is probable that no positive evidence established Paul's responsibility for the riot. Athanasius, in A, represents Paul's relegation to Emesa as a further instance of Constantius' caprice. But we may be safer to see in it, if not his original and only sentence, at least a mitigation of it. At Emesa, Paul will have learned of the fall of Stephen of Antioch, and read in that news the evidence of a Western ecclesiastical victory in which he must hasten to participate. So we must suppose him to have seized some opportunity to break bounds and hasten back to Constantinople, where, as the settlement made by Constantius opposed no barrier to his recovery of his see, he evidently received another rapturous welcome home. This should have taken place in the summer of 344, the year after Stephen fell. This is the year in which the latest evidence is found of the tenure of the office of Praetorian Prefect of Oriens by Leontius.[149] Not until after some interval is there known evidence of the succession of Philip to this Prefecture. But there is nothing, on the other hand, that argues against the succession having taken place in the later part of 344.

N^3 is a graphic story of Paul's eviction by Philip, the circumstances of which gain, vastly, in appropriateness, if the occasion were that of Philip's first state visit to the capital. According to this story, Philip held a reception for the city notables, to which he bade Paul. The public building selected for the ceremony was the Bath of Zeuxippus, built by Severus, on the south side of the Agora of old Byzantium.[150] It must have been the noblest public building of the old city, and contained a hall, lit with glass lamps, which Codinus describes[151] as a *δημόσιον γυμνάσιον*. Its position was in close proximity to the palace. And we may read evidence of prior consultation between Philip and the Chamberlain in the fact that a building should have been chosen whence there was private access by a closed passage to the palace. Natu-

[149] J. R. Palanque, Essai sur la Préfecture du Prétoire du Bas-Empire (1933), pp. 20–22.

[150] S.v. Byzantion, Pauly-Wissowa, iii, 1122.

[151] George Codinus, De originibus Constantinopolitanis, and De Signis, (C.S. H.B., Edn. I. Bekker, 1043) pp. 12, 36, and 38.

rally, Paul saw in his invitation to the reception the proof that his return to his see was to receive imperial recognition. So, likewise, the crowd that watched the dignitaries entering the reception-hall must have noted with satisfaction the figure of their bishop as he passed the guards at the door. But when, within, Paul reached the Prefect, he was presented with an imperial warrant for his perpetual banishment from the realms of Constantius. So, for the time, Paul had banked too heavily on the strength of Constans and the weakness of his brother. And as it was evident to him that he was trapped, and resistance would be futile, he suffered himself to be led out through the private passage, and so down through the enclosed gardens of the palace to the little private harbor of the palace, called Boukelion, on the sea of Marmora. There, out of sight and hearing of the crowd waiting before the Bath of Zeuxippus, he was put aboard the vessel that bore him swiftly away to Thessalonica. The passage which had swallowed up Paul presently disgorged Macedonius and his consecrators, bringing the reception to its destined end. The Prefect then led out Macedonius to sit beside him in his chariot. The waiting crowds were thunderstruck. Then the significance of the spectacle was grasped, and as word passed from lip to lip, the people flocked from every side to the mother-church, the Church of Holy Peace. As, therefore, the Prefect's procession drew near the church, the troops leading the way found the crowd so thick that they could not clear a road. Wrongly supposing that they were meeting with deliberate resistance, they used their weapons on the people. The result was a stampede in which many more were trodden to death than fell by the sword. And so, the author of N observes with the grim satisfaction of a Novatian, the episcopate of the second state-bishop was, before its inception, as bloodstained as that of his predecessor through almost a decade.

Socrates, not recognizing that Thessalonica, the goal of Paul's journey, was in the domain of Constans, so that Philip had given Paul "the key of the street," imagined this to be relegation to a place of internment, with some liberty of movement.[152] So he

[152] In Socrates, H.E., ii, 16, Philip, after ordering Paul to Thessalonica, adds the ironical leave ἀδεῶς τε ἐπιβαίνειν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας τῶν ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς πόλεις, meaning "or anywhere else you like, in Illyria."

invented a feigned journey, on Paul's part, to Corinth, to account for his ensuing travel in the West. In fact, the West was as free to him as the East was now closed.[153]

IX. The Final Stage

Paul's Western travel brought him swift success. An unnamed synod of orthodox bishops, we are told in P[5], unanimously condemned the "unfilial" conduct of Macedonius in accepting consecration to Paul's throne. We may guess that the unnamed synod was that of Milan in 345. The temper of the West was now rising. Socrates cites a supposed letter of Constans to Constantius, threatening to put Athanasius and Paul in their sees again by armed force.[154] De Valois, in his note on this passage,[155] recognizes that it reads more like an ecclesiastic's notion of what the Western Emperor should write than actual diplomatic. But notions of some such threat were widespread, and find as blunt expression in Philostorgius[156] as in Theodoret.[157] It is certain that as the military necessities of Constantius made his brother's good will increasingly indispensable, it grew less and less practicable for him to go on resisting the demands of the Western bishops. The source of the "letter" as cited in Socrates would appear to be some work of Western origin of a polemical nature. And we may attribute to the same or a similar source the description, in Socrates, of the last return of Paul to Constantinople,[158] furnished with letters of Constans and of "the synod," *μετὰ δυεῖν ἐπισκόπων καὶ τῆς ἄλλης τιμῆς*. Socrates, placing Sardica in 347, thought that that was "the synod." But this return of Paul was probably in 346. By that year Athanasius reached home, though he would not move until he had the fullest guarantees of protection from Constantius. But Paul, Socrates says, returned *παραχρῆμα*, presenting to the officials of Constantius

[153] H.E., ii, 17. The point is not reproduced in Sozomen. In the middle fourth century the directest route from Thessalonica to Rome via Dyrrachium was still in use.

[154] Socrates, H.E., ii, 22.

[155] E. Schwartz argues to the same effect in an article Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts, Z.N.T.W. (1935), xxxiv, 139, Note 4.

[156] H.E., iii, 12.

[157] H.E., ii, 8.

[158] H.E., ii, 23.

the letters of Constans. Those officials had had instruction from Constantius to receive Paul.[159] But the Chamberlain was not likely to forget the humiliation. We may suppose that the two bishops came with Paul to represent the synod of Milan. ἡ ἄλλη τίμη may indicate that Paul also had the company of an imperial officer and his men-at-arms. Macedonius, thus for the time dispossessed of the bishopric, continued liturgy in a single church.[160] We hear, later, of a church built by him, in which, in 382, the remains of Paul were laid to rest, so that it came to be called the Paul-church, and the people eventually supposed it to be dedicated to the apostle of the Gentiles.[161] The hagiographer of the Holy Notaries permits himself a surprising addition to the text of P^5, in saying, of Macedonius, that the poor followed him, when he was removed from bishopric, ἦν γάρ, φησίν, ὁ ἄνθρωπος φιλόπτωχος. It suggests that Macedonius was a man of means. As Socrates says that he retained this church after the enthronement of Eudoxius in 360, it seems likely that the building was the property of Macedonius. So, for five years, the Christians of Constantinople were ranged in opposing camps. The state of truce between them was based on a balance of power which became unstable, in 350, when Magnentius overthrew Constans. Until after the battle of Mursa, on 28 September 351, it was in doubt which way the balance of ecclesiastical power at Constantinople would turn.[162] The Prefect Philip was with Constantius at Mursa. But P^7 shows that he returned to overthrow the Paulist cause.[163] It may be substantially true that, as P says, Paul and his notaries suffered for loyalty to the Nicene faith. But the form of their punishment is eloquent of a charge of civil offence. There is no ground for doubting that Magnentius had sent letters to Paul. And it is probable that Paul behaved as correctly, under those circumstances, as did Athanasius. The palace at Constantinople may even have been somewhat in his

[159] L.c.

[160] καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς πόλεως τὰς συνόδους ποιούμενος.

[161] Soz., H.E., vii, 10.

[162] Socrates records the final exile of Paul two chapters before the submission of Vetranio, December 350, but it would be rash to conclude that this was based on sound chronology.

[163] Athanasius, De fuga, 3, also lays the responsibility for Paul's sentence on Philip.

debt for steadying popular reaction to the events of 350. Such a supposition accords with the fact that Paul escaped with his life. That the Holy Notaries were executed seems to show that evidence of treasonable correspondence was found against them. Paul was taken as a prisoner to Cucusus. There we lose sight of him. He would still not have been over sixty had he lived till the days of Julian, and Constantinople would surely have seen him again if he had lived so long. There were dark stories of his being done to death, such as was told to Serapion of Thmuis at the Court of Constantius by Philagrius, who had, at the time of Paul's exile, been Vicar of Pontus.[164] The story in Franchi de' Cavalieri's second recension, that the local headman at Cucusus, using his scarf, throttled Paul in his dungeon is probably a variant of the same story.[165] Athanasius believed the story, but Sozomen tried in vain to get confirmation of it.[166] The probability is that Paul died a natural death. He never receives any title but ὁ ὁμολογητής, and his remains were brought from Ancyra [167] to be laid to rest in his name-church in 382, by Nectarius and the bishops assembled at the synod in Constantinople. The Vita Pauli in Photius describes the solemnities beginning by a procession of bishops that went out beyond Chalcedon to meet the relics.[168] But the people, who promptly instituted a cultus of the Holy Notaries, as quickly forgot Paul, so that, by the time of Sozomen, they had actually transferred his name-church, in their own minds, to the apostle of the Gentiles.

After Paul was gone, Macedonius was bishop in Constantinople for nearly nine years before he was replaced by Eudoxius. To judge from what Socrates says, it was the Novatians who had

[164] So A, supported by De fuga, 3. The version in P can hardly be dependent on Athanasius. The story in De fuga, beginning *διώξαντες καὶ εὑρόντες*, has been taken to mean that Paul fled from Constantinople. But this language is meant to be picturesque, that "the quarry was tracked down" at Cucusus does not tell against the plain statement of exile to Cucusus in A.

[165] L.c., p. 173.

[166] H.E., iv, 2.

[167] Socrates, H.E., v, 9, without other support. The second Vita Pauli (P.G. cxvi, 884–896A) substitutes Cucusus, and asserts Paul's martyrdom in the words *ἔνθα καὶ τῷ δι' ἀγχόνης τῶν δυσσεβῶν νύκτωρ ἐπισπευδόντων τελειοῦται μαρτυρίῳ* (892C).

[168] P.G. civ, 129D–131A.

most reason to hate Macedonius.[169] Doctrinally he was Homoiousian, and in the eyes of Philostorgius "no better than a Nicene." [170] But P^{5-8} has telescoped his days into those of Eudoxius, and confused the prosecution of the Notaries under Philip (who had been disgraced by 353) with the persecution of the Paulists by Eudoxius, ten years later. What that should prove is that the Paulists had little to complain of under Macedonius. The days of Euxodius were but a third as long, and yet they stretched back, in the mind of the author of P, till they mingled with the events of 352. The story of the all-but-successful extermination of the Homoousian church in Constantinople, by the alliance of the palace and a time-serving bishop, is a tragic one, and there is agreement, in the telling of it, between Sozomen [171] and P. Perhaps the most miserable feature of the story is the use, by the Chamberlain Eusebius, of the σιτηρέσια as a means of conducting the religious war. Yet we must recognize that the pattern came from the hand of Constantius, when he halved the σιτηρέσια after the Hermogenes-riot of 342. For, in this whole story, the religious and the political mingle in a way that defies their disentanglement.

When we stand back from this picture of Paul's career, we see that it forms a very significant part of the picture of the birth of New Rome. Paul tried to be the Ambrose of Constantinople. He can have had few equals for sheer courage and pertinacity. He had other qualities of greatness besides. Although no single word of his has come down to us, he was, in the judgment of his contemporaries, both eloquent and an exponent of orthodox theology. He had personality that stirred, in the masses of Constantinople, a romantic loyalty to their bishop, and that kept them steadfast, in spite of adversity, for more than fifteen years. Insofar as his defeat is to be attributed to the religious policy of Constantius, he can claim a posthumous

[169] H.E., ii, 27 and 38, while including all Homoousians among the victims of Macedonius, seem to rest on Novatian evidence. Union was "nearly effected" between Paulists and Novatians, at this time, according to Sozomen, H.E., iv, 20, while iv, 2 agrees in details with P.

[170] H.E., iv, 9 (Bidez., p. 62).

[171] Sozomen, H.E., iv, 26, is in general terms. For the persecuting alliance of Eusebius the Eunuch with Eudoxius we learn for the first time from P^{8}.

victory in the days of Theodosius. But the causes of his failure go deeper than any ephemeral policy. The thing against which Paul strove was the inevitable character of Constantine's capital, impressed upon it by its founder, by its geographical situation, and by the trend of world-history alike. Constantinople was an artificial construction, a capital of the Orient, but built on the European shore of the Bosphorus. Its population was a vast assemblage of imperial dependants, bound in the long run to be dominated by the Great Palace, as the author of the city's prosperity. Under such circumstances, Paul's hopeless mistake was to defend the spiritual liberty of his church by waging with the palace a war that could only end in one way. The political theory that inspired his struggle was the Western theory, destined to be ousted from Constantinople by its Eastern rival, of which, in due course, Constantinople became the citadel. Of those who followed Paul in his bishopric, Chrysostom and Flavian imitated his attempt at independence and shared his tragic fate.

So, as we consider the story of the Constantinopolitan bishopric down the centuries, the oracle of Alexander takes on a new significance. The choice before Constantinople, it seems to say, was never a simple choice between this man or that. It was always a choice of the manner of bishop it would have. And the city being what it was, the decision, in the long run, was certain to be in favor of one inclining *πρὸς τὰ ἔξω πράγματα καὶ τὰς συνουσίας τῶν ἀρχόντων.*

Appendix, The Date of Sardica

The error of Socrates [172] and Sozomen [173] in naming 347 as the year of the synod of Sardica was disclosed as a result of the publication by Maffei of the Historia Acephala.[174] Sievers tells the story of subsequent fluctuations of opinion, in the introduction [175] to his edition of the Historia Acephala. It was the publication by Larsow, in 1852, of his translation of the Festal Letters of Athanasius, known through the discovery of part of the col-

[172] H.E., ii, 20.
[173] H.E., iii, 23.
[174] Osservazioni letterarie, iii (1738), 1–92.
[175] Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie, xxxviii (1868), 92–95.

lection, in a Syriac version, by Archdeacon Tatham ten years previously, that ended doubt, and resulted in the establishment of the date 343. This remained unquestioned until 1904, when Schwartz [176] proposed the date 342. In the following year he published his very full and careful argument for this date.[177] In 1909, Loofs took up the cudgels [178] for 343, and Schwartz replied two years later.[179] Loofs died without replying or admitting defeat. But Lietzmann, in 1938, in the third volume of his early church history, assumed Schwartz to be in possession of the field,[180] a view in which the present writer would concur on the strength of the arguments exchanged in the controversy. In 1936, however, the third volume of the Histoire de l'église edited by A. Fliche and V. Martin was published, containing a chapter by Bardy, in which he declared for 343 on the strength of arguments that had been brought forward by his colleague J. Zeiller.[181] But the most positive of these arguments [182] rests upon a mistaken reading of Athanasius.[183] Zeiller argues thus; the mission of Euphrates of Cologne and Vincent of Capua to the court of Constantius at Antioch must have been in the spring immediately following the synod of Sardica. Athanasius, so Zeiller says, dates the deposition of Stephen of Antioch, resulting from his scandalous plot against the Western envoys, as having taken place ten months before the death of Gregory, the Arian bishop in Alexandria. Therefore, since we have the date 26 June 345 for Gregory's death,[184] Stephen was deposed, Zeiller argues, in August 344, and so the synod of Sardica was in 343.

The statement of Athanasius, in fact, is that the death of Gregory occurred ten months after Constantius had restored

[176] Nachrichten v. d. Kgl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1904 (Phil. — hist. Kl.), 341.

[177] Christliche und Jüdische Ostertafeln (1905), No. viii in Abhandlungen d. Kgl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.

[178] Zur Synode von Sardika, in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, lxxxii (1909), 279–297.

[179] Schwartz, l.c., 515 ff.

[180] Geschichte der Altenkirche, iii, 195.

[181] Histoire de l'Eglise, iii, 123, Note 3.

[182] Les Origines chrétiennes dans les provinces Danubiennes, in Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes, Fasc. 112., (1918) 229–231.

[183] Hist. Ar., 21.

[184] Festal Index, to Letter for Easter 346.

liberty to the Athanasian congregations in Alexandria. This is the kind of time-interval that people would remember, since, for ten months, there had been a dual cultus in the city. The interval between the death of Gregory and the deposition of Stephen is not such as would be remembered. Athanasius is arguing that relief began to come to the Nicene cause in Egypt quite a while before his recall, because Stephen's plot had opened the Emperor's eyes to the villainy of the Eusebians. For this reason, he naturally ignores the lapse of time between the fall of Stephen and the benefit experienced by the Nicenes in Egypt. Presumably Zeiller, influenced by the suggestion of causal connection between the two events, assumed the deposition of Stephen to have preceded the liberation of the Athanasian congregations in Alexandria by only two or three months. But the thesis of Athanasius is highly questionable. The exposure of the plot against the Western envoys was, admittedly, a heavy reverse for the Eastern ecclesiastical cause, in its controversy with the West. And as it was followed up by the maintenance of steady political pressure upon Constantius to give contentment to the Western bishops, it is comprehensible that Constantius presently saw that a reversal of his ecclesiastical policy as regards Egypt could not be indefinitely postponed. But the probable tempo of this movement is slower than the narrative of Athanasius would suggest, and two or three months is likely to be much too short an interval between Stephen's deposition and the liberation at Alexandria. So Zeiller's argument does not turn the scales against Schwartz. The support given by P^2 to Theodoret's statement that Paul was called to Sardica, now prevents its dismissal. And if it stands, Sardica cannot have been in 343. The date 342 thus appears to have been made secure by P.

PHASES OF GROSSETESTE'S INTELLECTUAL LIFE

JOSIAH C. RUSSELL
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, N. M.

I

Nearly all scholars who have studied the career of Robert Grosseteste are in agreement that he was a dominant figure in the intellectual life of thirteenth century England.[1] Some of the ways in which this dominance was exercised are also clear: as bishop of Lincoln (1235–53) he was influential through his sermons, translations and other writings; as director of the Franciscan School at Oxford (ca.1231–5) he set a standard of erudition which appears in such students as Thomas of York and the well known Roger Bacon. Even before this he must have had some influence upon the University of Oxford but the evidence is capable of different interpretations. This is unfortunate because he was a master as early as 1189 and thus the greater part of his early and middle life is involved in mystery. Outside of scattered items there is for this period a curious biography by a later medieval monk, Richard of Bardney,[2] probably based in part upon an earlier biography. Then there is the very large number of writings which have been located and catalogued.[3]

[1] Recent studies of Grosseteste are by D. A. Callus, "The Oxford Career of Robert Grosseteste," Oxoniensia X (1945), 42–72; J. C. Russell, "Richard of Bardney's Account of Robert Grosseteste's Early and Middle Life," Medievalia et Humanistica II (1944), 45–54. The best general biography is by F. S. Stevenson (London, 1899) but he presents the very poor tradition of Grosseteste's life before he became bishop.

[2] Russell, op. cit. The value of the biography has been accepted by P. Grosjean, the Bollandist scholar (Analecta Bollandiana LXIV, 1946, 307). Callus (op. cit., p. 44) considers it valueless, but gives no evidence.

[3] S. H. Thomson, The Writings of Robert Grosseteste (Cambridge, 1940). As a result of an examination of several thousand manuscripts he lists 120 pieces besides sermons, letters and dicta. He also lists some 86 pieces attributed to Grosseteste but which he thinks are doubtful or spurious in attribution.

This study is an attempt to use certain techniques in regard to the bibliography of Grosseteste's works as well as more conventional data to bring more clarity into the evidence about the early life of the great bishop and scholar.

By the end of his career Grosseteste had become famous for emphasizing the importance of the study of three subjects as a part of theological training: the Bible, the languages in which the Bible was written (Greek, Hebrew), and the sciences. All of these, he felt, were needed to understand God's Word and World. He impressed his views upon the Franciscan School at Oxford [4] which in turn profoundly affected the whole Franciscan order and eventually such religious leaders as John Wyclif and John Hus outside of the order. Now a chance remark of Roger Bacon suggests that Grosseteste's interest in languages developed only late in life.[5] It suggests that his career unfolded gradually as new interests appeared and that the intellectual phases of his life should be more than ordinarily interesting.

The problem of understanding the career of Grosseteste is complicated by his refusal to follow the conventional pattern of clerical careers of his day. He became archdeacon of Leicester in 1229 and might have been expected to hold that position until he became bishop in 1235. Actually he resigned the archdeaconry in 1232 and devoted himself to teaching the Franciscans. Earlier he had served at least three bishops as clerk: Hugh of Lincoln about 1186–9, William of Hereford before 1199, and Giles of Hereford, probably about 1225. Yet during the same period he studied and taught in the schools. He reminds us of some of our colleagues who have sandwiched government service between periods of academic life. He apparently commenced the study of theology at Paris about 1210 which most scholars would have pursued until completion about 1218.[6] Yet knowing of the erratic course of Grosseteste's career we cannot be certain that he did continue it to the end.

Grosseteste complicated the problem of his biographers further

[4] The classical account of this school is by A. G. Little, "The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century," Archivum Franciscanum Historicum XIX (1926), 1–74.

[5] Opera Ined. (Ed. Brewer), Opus Tertium, 91.

[6] This Callus' assumption. "The Oxford Career," pp. 48–9, 72.

by refusing to write autobigraphically except upon rare occasions. Thus the great mass of his writings has yielded little information about his life. However, there are two principles which may be applied to the bibliography of Grosseteste's manuscripts to extract some clues to his life. The first is that scholars whose writings are as numerous as those of Grosseteste pursue their publication with a reasonable degree of evenness throughout their scholarly career: writing is a normal function of their lives. Thus a proportion of writings should have come from about the same proportion of their lives or the parts of them devoted to particular interests. The second principle is that the place of original composition (England or the continent) is often indicated by the present distribution of manuscripts, particularly of those manuscripts written within a century or so of the original composition. Since these two principles have not been applied to the great bulk of Grosseteste's works, they offer some hope of adding to our meagre information about this scholar.

The use of the first principle is handicapped by the differing types of writing attempted by Grosseteste.[7] His translations naturally ran to great length, possibly because he had assistants.[8] Likewise, his Biblical commentaries are quite extensive. How can these be compared with his numerous very short and highly concentrated treatises upon natural philosophy in which a few pages show the results of wide reading and careful thought. Nothing like mathematical certainty is possible, and none is attempted.

The other principle has recently been used to show that, since the manuscripts of the works of Honorius Augustodunensis remain in south Germany, he probably lived and taught there rather than in Autun.[9] Even in regard to Grosseteste limited use of the

[7] This principle is well illustrated with respect to modern scholars by L. S. Woodburne, "Prospective Usefulness of Staff Members," Association of American Colleges Bulletin XXX (1944), 335–46. For a medieval list see the writings of Gerald of Wales. (Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, ed. J. S. Brewer, III, 372–3). Almost any list of the works of modern scholars will illustrate the principle.

[8] J. C. Russell, "The Preferments and 'Adiutores' of Robert Grosseteste," Harvard Theological Review XXVI (1933), 161–72.

[9] E. M. Sanford, "Honorius, *Presbyter* and *Scholasticus*," Speculum XXIII (1948), 398–9. Cf. as another case, R. W. Hunt, "English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century," Trans. Royal Hist. Soc., 4th series, XIX (1936), 21–2.

principle has been tried, particularly for two treatises which the bishop is suspected of writing at the Council of Lyons.[10] The manuscripts are distributed as follows.

	England		Continent	
	XIII Cent.	Later	XIII Cent.	Later
No. 6	0	11	6	35
No. 12	1	0	1	3(?)

A limitation upon the use of the distribution of manuscripts is the fact that many manuscripts may have survived in the possession of the author. Grosseteste would naturally have had them in England with him at the end of his life.[11] This creates a natural bias in favor of the existence of manuscripts in England.

In dealing with the bibliography of Grosseteste the works which fall naturally into the interests of the several parts of his career will be analyzed for indications of length of time and place of composition. Since the latter part of his life is best known, we begin there showing how the principles operate. Then the study moves back through the period of theological teaching at Oxford, especially with the Franciscans, to the uncertain period before 1225. By isolating the works which can be assigned to the latter part of his life, the character of the works of the earlier part can be made to stand out more clearly. Finally we deal with some rather unexpected information which comes from an unstudied treatise on court etiquette which illuminates his earlier years.

II

Grosseteste was elected bishop of Lincoln in 1235 and died in 1253. Since he was a master at least 46 years before he attained this dignity he must have been nearly 70 at his election. Yet within the period of his episcopate come all of his translations, many of them long.[12] These translations occupy a respectable

[10] Thomson, Writings, pp. 60, 68. See also his note on no. 11 about the one ascribed manuscript.

[11] This is probably the case with the English manuscript of no. 12.

[12] On the dates of these see, in general, Thomson, Writings under nos. 1–13.

place in the great body of translations of Greek theology and science of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Grosseteste's interest was quite as much in accuracy of translation as in transmission of crude knowledge. He was interested in gaining as accurate information as he could and this led him to a careful study of language. The other pieces assigned to this period are devotional, pastoral and controversial. Despite the appearance of an occasional odd piece, like the Compotus Minor (no. 43) the period saw a reasonably homogenous production. They were the professional products, for the most part, of a man who wrote easily and expressed himself well in writing.

It can be seen (Appendix, Table I) that with a few exceptions the pieces which are assigned to this period and which were mostly written in England still remain in English manuscript collections in spite of the great eminence of Grosseteste in European academic circles at the end of his career. The number of pieces is somewhat above forty and the number of folios runs into the hundreds, partly as a result of the diffuse character of translations. It is amazing that Grosseteste, even with help, continued to write at such length amid the distractions and responsibilities of the administration of the vast diocese of Lincoln. It can be assumed then that earlier responsibilities would not have distracted him from his writing either and that we do not have to make allowances for periods of administrative duties.

The pieces assigned to the years 1225–35 (Appendix, Table II) are, for the most part, theological.[13] When carefully documented they seem even to fall within the second half of the decade. Although the number of folios runs high, the number of compositions is not great. If continuous the effort devoted to this group of works should not have occupied many years of the scholar's life. This raises the question why, if Grosseteste really did complete his theological training by about 1218, he produced so few works, all apparently a decade later.[14] It is true that Grosseteste

[13] See Thomson, Writings under numbers cited. Callus ("The Oxford Career," pp. 56 ff) assigns to this period nos. 34, 35, 63, 67, 68, 74, 75.

[14] An exception must be made for Grosseteste's unfinished Summa which was probably earlier. Cf. D. A. Callus, "The Summa Theologiae of Robert Grosseteste," Studies in Mediaeval History presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke (Oxford, 1948), pp. 180–208.

was archdeacon of Leicester during these years (1229–32) but he, like other archdeacon professors, probably served his archdeaconry mostly by officials. In any case the heavy concentration of manuscripts of these works preserved in England is evidence that he was in England during the period.

The titles assigned to the last two periods of Grosseteste's life, from 1225 to 1253, subtract a great many from the total list. Many of the remaining pieces, which we assume to be the product of his earlier life are short pieces but they involve a great deal of careful thought. These pieces are listed in two tables (Appendix, Tables III and IV) divided as their manuscripts occur primarily in England or on the continent.

The numbers in the third table, that of pieces whose manuscripts are predominantly from the continent are twice those of the last table. This would suggest that the career of Grosseteste before he entered its theological phase about 1225 was very largely concerned with the continent. If we assume, as most do, that his active career as a writer began about 1199 two-thirds of the period 1199–1225 should be associated with the continent. Thus if he was at Oxford in the decade 1199–1209 the rest of the time should have been spent on the continent. A second observation on the two lists is that there is very little difference in their subject matter: both are heavily scientific. On the other hand there exists much difference between these lists and the lists coming from his later life.

The evidence, however, leaves us with some problems to solve: (1) why are the theological treatises composed after 1225 if Grosseteste was a doctor of theology by 1218? (2) why are so many of the manuscripts of the period 1199–1225 continental if he spent most of this time in England? (3) what was the relationship of Grosseteste to the schools of England during the period? and (4) did he write nothing in the period before 1199?

III

Why are the theological treatises composed after 1225 if he was a doctor of theology by 1218? Some evidence upon this may be given by one of the few autobiographical items given by

Grosseteste.[15] In one of his sermons 'describing the different qualities of a person' he says:

First, I was a clerk, then master of theology and priest, and afterwards bishop.

Here then we find Grosseteste associating closely his attainment of the advanced degree with his priesthood. The question arises as to the interpretation of the association of the two. The higher degree did not require the priesthood: thus no causal connection is implied. The conferring of priesthood usually required a definite reason: the holding of a living with cure of souls in the case of a secular clerk or an opportunity for hearing confessions and saying mass for the regular clerks. Grosseteste gives no reason. The only obvious reason for the association would be one of time: that is, that Grosseteste became a priest about the time that he became a master or doctor of theology. Since the order is obviously chronological in other respects the connection is also probably one of time.

The conjunction of the priesthood in time with the higher degree appears also in Bardney's much maligned life.[16] He reverses the order but presents them consecutively. His best source probably stopped about 1225 so that if the two occurred later, he must have got his information elsewhere, perhaps from this sermon. In any case he placed the events approximately in the period 1210–5 during Grosseteste's Paris stay. However, we can be certain that the time is wrong since Grosseteste was still only a deacon in 1225.[17] If there is a temporal connection then Grosseteste must also have received his advanced theological degree after 1225 also.

Now the item from the sermon would not be particularly convincing alone, since it is capable of interpretation over a wide period: that is, Grosseteste might have been a master of theology

[15] Callus, "The Oxford Career," p. 52. 'Primo fui clericus, deinde magister in theologia et presbiter, et tandem episcopus.'

The theory that Grosseteste was doctor before 1221 rests upon two hypotheses (1) that Grosseteste was chancellor of Oxford before 1221, and (2) that one had to be a doctor of theology before he was chancellor of Oxford. Both of these will be discussed later.

[16] His life of Grosseteste is edited in the Anglia Sacra, II, 325–41.

[17] Rotuli Hugonis de Welles (Lincoln Record Society, 1914), III, 48.

a long time before he became a priest although the punctuation by *deinde* and *tandem* suggests a close temporal connection. However, other evidence fits in nicely. The short list of theological treatises suggests a short time of composition (1230–5 rather than 1218–35). Then there is the tradition that he studied with Edmund of Abingdon who probably was still teaching at Oxford in 1225.[18] Furthermore, Grosseteste begins to appear in documents associated with Oxford in 1231, when he is named next to Ralph of Maidstone, the chancellor of the university. An easy guess is that Grosseteste had preceded Maidstone as chancellor,[19] perhaps in the years 1228–31. We place 1225 as the beginning of this period of Grosseteste's life since that year marks the first clear indication of his connection with England after 1209.

IV

The evidence of the manuscripts shows that Grosseteste's interests were mainly scientific in the first quarter of the thirteenth century. It also would tend to indicate that approximately two-thirds of the time was spent on the continent. The first third, however, was apparently spent in England. His activities there continued on the continent so that the two periods may best be considered consecutively.

The beginning of Grosseteste's connection with Oxford according to Bardney followed the death of a bishop with whom he was associated. This bishop is stated to have been the bishop of Salisbury but this is probably a mistake for William de Vere, bishop of Hereford, who died in 1199.[20] Thus Grosseteste probably went to the rapidly rising institution of Oxford shortly thereafter. Another document also gives some interesting information about his position at Oxford, but the document has been the subject of varying interpretations. It is a statement which Bishop Oliver Sutton is alleged to have made in the course of a controversy in 1295.[21]

[18] Callus, "The Oxford Career," p. 52.

[19] Calendar of Close Rolls, 1227–31, p. 520; ibid, 1231–4, p. 568.

[20] On this problem see Russell, "Richard of Bardney's Account," p. 48.

[21] Callus, "The Oxford Career," p. 48 citing Snappe's Formulary, p. 319. "Beatus Robertus quondam Licolniensis episcopus, qui huiusmodi officium gessit dum in Universitate predicta regebat, in principio creationis sue in episcopum dixit

Blessed Robert [Grosseteste] formerly bishop of Lincoln who carried an office of this kind [the chancellorship] while he was regent in the aforesaid university [Oxford] in the beginning of his creation as bishop said that his immediate predecessor as bishop of Lincoln [Hugh of Welles] had not permitted him to be called chancellor but only master of the schools.

The statement would seem to show clearly that Grosseteste had been chosen as master of the schools (the earlier title for the head of the university), that he was trying to get the title changed from master of the schools to that of chancellor, and that the bishop, Hugh of Welles (1209–35) had refused. In that period the older and better-known university, Paris, had a chancellor: it would be only natural that Oxford should try to attain a similar status. Oxford deserved to be distinguished from the many other English schools of the time whose heads were known as 'masters of the schools.'[22] The schools of Oxford were permitted by a papal legate to become the University of Oxford in 1214. Presumably its head became a chancellor at the same time although no reference to any head appears in the charter.[23] However, when a head is first mentioned he is given that title. This incident should have preceded the elevation of Oxford to university status because it is difficult to believe that Bishop Hugh of Welles would have denied the university or its head anything that the papal legate had given it.

There were two times when the question of raising the title of 'master of schools' to a higher title might have been presented to Bishop Hugh of Welles: just before and just after the dispersion

---

proximum predecessorem suum episcopum Lincolniensem non permisisse quod idem Robertus vocaretur cancellarius sed magister scholarum."

[22] On the relationship of early Oxford with contemporary schools see my "The Early Schools of Oxford and Cambridge," The Historian V (1943), 61–76.

[23] Callus ("The Oxford Career," pp. 48–9) believes that this document comes from about 1218. His reasons may be compared with the above. He insists also that the Master Alard who was 'rector' in 1210 must have been elected before the University dispersed in 1209. Nothing seems more natural than that the 'rump' university of 1210 should have elected a head if the previous head had left. Medieval institutions, unlike the modern, never felt the need of delegation of power to organize from a higher authority. Their theory was that the right to organize was inherent in any body with a life of its own.

Furthermore, Callus' statement that the master of the schools had to have a doctorate of philosophy is untenable. There were scores of 'masters of the schools' in England then: there just were not enough doctors to go around.

of the university, in either 1209 or in 1213–4. Hugh of Welles was a clerk of King John who served that king even during the Interdict until his election as bishop in the spring of 1209, apparently just after March 29.[24] He appears as bishop-elect in royal charters of April 12 and 14,[25] then left England for consecration, and returned only in the summer of 1213.[26] Hugh was thus around the court for a few weeks before he crossed the Channel: that would have been a logical time for Grosseteste to raise the question. The bishopric of Lincoln had been vacant for several years. The other time would have been after Oxford reopened in 1213 or 1214. This seems less likely because the university under the circumstances would hardly have been aggressive enough to have asked immediately for the change to university status. Then also if Grosseteste was 'master of the schools' in 1213–4, he must have been raised to the chancellorship very soon, so that the story would have had little point.

Furthermore, there is a possibility that the story itself lends credence to the year 1209 rather than 1213–4. As it stands the curious expression 'at the beginning of his creation as bishop' must refer to Grosseteste, but it certainly has no particular significance with regard to Grosseteste since there was no question about the beginning of his election as bishop in 1235 and the university status was satisfactory then. The expression would have had a real meaning with regard to Hugh since he did not return to his diocese to commence his episcopal duties for four years: his creation as bishop was thus somewhat lengthy. Hugh's election, as mentioned above, followed a vacancy of several years in which the University was growing rapidly to the place where it wished the name of university and wished it badly. Now in the telling of the tale the expression may have been shifted so that it referred to Grosseteste rather than to Hugh of Welles where it originally belonged.[27] Furthermore, if Grosseteste was

[24] Rotuli Chartarum, p. 185b.

[25] Ibid., p. 185b.

[26] Ibid., p. 193b.

[27] It is doubtful if Oliver Sutton heard the tale directly from Grosseteste since items about him begin to appear regularly only about 1270. D.N.B. under Sutton, Oliver. An item of 1244 occurs so long before the rest that one doubts if it refers to him.

chosen chancellor about 1228–31, as suggested above, the expression would have been of value to show that it was in 1209 rather than in 1228–31 that Hugh refused the title to Robert.

The evidence would then tend to show that Grosseteste was at Oxford during the decade 1199–1209, but there is no trace of him in England between 1209 and 1225. This is surely significant in view of the excellence of the documentary sources of the period. His absence from Oxford helps explain the lack of scholars who had him for a master. The earliest of the Oxford men who show his influence seems to be Adam of Buckfield who studied there only in the 1230s.[28] Grosseteste also has to be eliminated as one of the founders and pillars of the university as it was reconstituted in 1214. Indeed it seems more likely that the leaders were men like Edmund of Abingdon, Robert of Bingham and Robert Bacon.[29] They were men of a distinctly religious turn of mind, if not really great scholars; excellent enough so that we do not have to credit the mendicant orders with the revival of the university or even of its school of theology.

If Grosseteste did not influence Oxford after 1209 for several decades, he was certainly in the heart of its scientific interests before that date.[30] This was the time apparently of the entrance of Aristotelian learning with its Arabic commentaries: the combination of the great pagan's works with their infidel commentaries was something to create doubt in the minds of the faithful. Bardney relates a story that Grosseteste made a brazen head which was able to tell the truth. This myth apparently developed

[28] Cf. my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England (London, 1936), pp. 2–3 for his life. On recent study of his works see S. H. Thomson, "The Works of Master Adam of Bocfeld," Medievalia et Humanistica II (1943), 55–87; D. A. Callus, "Introduction of Aristotelian Learning to Oxford," Proceedings of the British Academy (1943), p. 256.

[29] For these men see my Dictionary, pp. 25–7, 131–2, and 130–1 respectively. On Robert Bacon see a recent and excellent article by B. Smalley, "Robert Bacon and the early Dominican School at Oxford," Trans. of the Royal Hist. Soc., 4th series, XXX (1948), 1–19. The possibility of the influence of Richard Poore in English intellectual circles should also be kept in mind. Before he was bishop of three English sees and a great courtier he had been a professor of theology at Paris.

[30] Callus (Introduction of Aristotelian Learning, pp. 229–81 especially the last few pages) would associate the entrance of Aristotelian learning with Edmund of Abingdon about 1216–9. I should associate it with Alexander Nequam somewhat earlier and possibly with those two mysterious translators, Roger of Hereford and Alfred of Sareshal.

about Grosseteste as a result of his science just as tales were told about Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay in the next generation. At the same time we have references to two masters, possibly if not probably of Oxford, who were famous as foretellers of the future, Gervase of Melkley and Roger de Insula.[31] There was danger here. Perhaps it was a misgiving over the character of his subject matter that caused Edmund of Abingdon to turn from commenting upon the Sophistici Elenchi, of which he was probably the first commentator at Oxford. He took up theology at Paris after a dream in which his mother advised the change. Perhaps also this was connected with the very severe penance which he performed during the last 36 years of his life, that is, from about 1204.[32]

V

The new knowledge was banned at Paris by a decree of 1210 by a local council.[33] It condemned the works of certain men, one dead, and forbade the teaching of the Aristotelian books on natural philosophy and their commentaries. No cause for this action is given, but the advent of professors from Oxford may well have been the decisive factor. According to the poet, Henry of Avranches, John Blund taught the *libri naturales* of Aristotle first at Oxford and at Paris: the order is probably significant.[34] The known facts of Blund's life make it probable that he moved from England to France about 1209. Grosseteste also apparently made the move at this time. The evidence that he was in France and at Paris during the Interdict is stronger than most evidence

[31] See my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England, pp. 37–8 and 144 respectively.

[32] Callus believes that Edmund went to Paris with the others in 1209. However, 1204 seems a more satisfactory date since it fits in with Edmund's penance. Edmund's life was so exemplary that it seems doubtful if he would have done penance for anything but an intellectual failure. The ten years usually required for theological study would thus also have been completed by 1214 when he is thought to have returned to England.

[33] For a translation of the decree see Lynn Thorndike, University Records and Life in the Middle Ages (New York, 1944), pp. 26–7.

[34] J. C. Russell and J. P. Heironimus, The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches relating to England (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), p. 131: Callus, "Introduction of Aristotelian Learning to Oxford," Proceedings of the British Academy (1943), pp. 12–26.

for his early life.[35] There may have been other professors of the new and suspect knowledge: our information about this phase of intellectual life is very limited. It is probable that the influx of these enthusiasts for the learning of Aristotle may have led the older professors to stir the local council to action which would silence dangerous ideas or perhaps just remove competition.

Bardney gives the impression that after a time and as a result of the decree against the new learning Grosseteste regretted his former interest and turned to theology.[36] The regret may be doubted. In 1215–6 he was busily engaged in copying precisely this type of information from an unidentified manuscript.[37] As we have seen the writings of Grosseteste throughout the period reflect his interest in science, much of which was based upon Aristotle. It is probable that the decree of 1210 curbed his teaching,[38] but his interest in theology may well have developed concurrently in the presence of the great Parisian masters. Indeed one writing has been preserved which would seem to be an expanded set of lecture notes of Philip the Chancellor of the years 1208–10.[39] Th subject is the soul (De Anima), not surprising in view of treatises upon the same subject by Oxford masters, Alexander Nequam and John Blund of a slightly earlier time.[40] It is possible that Grosseteste was teaching in the faculty of arts at the same time that he was studying theology: this would explain why the lecture notes on Pnilip are so early in his career at Paris.

The study of theology was usually an eight year course or longer. Since we have allowed Grosseteste about five years for study at Oxford, he should have had the earlier part at Paris, lasting four or five years. Recently a case has been made for

[35] See Callus, "The Oxford Career," pp. 49–51.

[36] Anglia Sacra, II, 333. For this chapter in his life see my, "Richard of Bardney's Account," pp. 53–4.

[37] Thomson, Writings, pp. 30–2.

[38] If not the decree of 1210, the still more drastic decree of 1215 must have done so. For a translation of the later decree see Thorndike, op. cit., p. 28.

[39] Thomson, Writings, pp. 89–90. Leo Keelor, "The Dependence of R. Grosseteste's De Anima on the Summa of Philip the Chancellor," New Scholasticism VII (1933), 197–219.

[40] Callus, "Introduction of Aristotelian Learning to Oxford," pp. 249–50. Possibly Blund's treatise is later, however.

the writing of an unfinished Summa [41] which may have been the product of his Paris days, since the author says, "[the fragments] corroborate the tradition of his pursuing his theological studies in Paris." [42] The unfinished character of the project would indicate a change of plan or more probably an interruption of his work. He may have completed the four or five years necessary for the degree of bachelor of theology which usually preceded the doctorate or master's degree: the two terms were used almost indifferently then. The period covered would have been about 1210–15 which takes us to the second decree against the teaching of Aristotelian matter, or possibly to the great crisis in English history of that year.[43]

That, of course, was the year of Magna Carta. Now John quickly got a dispensation from that document and prepared to defy the barons. They, in turn, set up the son of the King of France as their candidate for the English throne, an act which produced a war lasting until 1218. Many English clerks as well as barons sided with the French prince. One of them, Simon Langton, was not admitted into England until 1227 even though he was brother of the archbishop, Stephen Langton,[44] but his offense had been especially heinous since he had acted as chancellor for Prince Louis. Elias of Derham, the great artist and architect, was permitted to return in 1219, apparently so that he might assist in the construction of the shrine of Thomas Becket.[45] Now Bardney says that Grosseteste served an aging king in his court: [46] this must have been Philip Augustus, who died in 1223. Since Grosseteste does not appear in England until after this year, it is likely that he served until the king's death.

The continental chapter of Grosseteste's career must have been a reasonably exciting one with the decrees of prohibition and

[41] D. A. Callus, "The Summa Theologiae of Robert Grosseteste," Studies in Mediaeval History presented to F. M. Powicke (Oxford, 1948), 180–208.

[42] Ibid., p. 194.

[43] See note 38 above. Grosseteste knew that on the question of the eternity of matter Aristotle was a heretic. J. T. Muckle, "Robert Grosseteste's Use of Greek Sources in his Hexameron," Medievalia et Humanistica III (1945), 37.

[44] On this interesting character see Russell, Dictionary, p. 153.

[45] See Russell, "The Many-Sided Career of Master Elias of Dereham," Speculum V (1930), 385. Also Russell, "Richard of Bardney's Account," pp. 53–4.

[46] Ibid., pp. 53–4.

the association with Philip Augustus. His interests remained scientific but with a secondary interest in theology: he probably had a very considerable reputation as a scientist at this time. Now this may or may not have been an advantage from the standpoint of his career. It does not seem to have been sufficient to gain him promotion within the French Church. This is not surprising in view of the Church's hostility to Aristotle as indicated by the decree of 1210. On the other hand his association with Philip Augustus must have blocked at least for the time being the possibility of advancement within the English Church. Probably his reputation as a theologian later presented him to the public eye as a scientist rather than a magician.

VI

Among Grosseteste's writings is a long poem on court etiquette.[47] A natural inclination is to assume that it was a product of his association with the French King and the French Court. However, examination shows that it comes from an earlier period of Grosseteste's life, a period of immaturity and of much more limited interests. Since almost no writing has been identified as coming from his earlier years this treatise is very valuable even though the formal character of the treatise limits the type of information in it. Furthermore, Grosseteste here as usual is singularly averse to giving any information about himself. Nevertheless, the writing of any treatise reveals indications of the writer's education and outlook unless, of course, the author is merely copying earlier material. Of this there is no evidence.

Besides the immaturity of the presentation there are other indications that the poem comes from early in Grosseteste's life. The earliest charter in which his name appears, of Lincoln of about 1186–9, gives the form of his last name as 'Grosteste.'[48] This is the form in which it appears in the title of the piece. Later

[47] Thomson, Writings, pp. 148–9. Professor Thomson very kindly loaned me the rotographs of the manuscript containing the piece, Oxford, Trinity College, MS 18, fos. 169r–72r.

[48] On the date of this charter see my "The Preferments and *Adiutores* of Robert Grosseteste," Harvard Theological Review XXVI (1933), 162–3. In the Hereford charters before 1199 his name is translated "Grossicapite." Since his name occurs last in the Lincoln charter he is likely to have been the writer of the charter.

he seems to have used the Latin form, 'Grosseteste' rather than the Anglo-Norman form. Furthermore, the treatise shows the obvious influence of the great Lincoln teacher, William de Monte or de Montibus, of whom it has been said, 'His main efforts were directed to driving home simple lessons, by any means possible.' [49] Like de Monte also Grosseteste wrote very poor poetry and, probably realizing it, gave it up before long as a medium for his expression.

The time of the poem may be estimated a little more closely by another approach. Just before Grosseteste joined the bishop of Hereford (he died in 1199) Gerald of Wales wrote the bishop a well known note stating that Grosseteste was well versed in arts and knew something of law and medicine. At least that is how Gerald's somewhat cryptic and perhaps general praise has been interpreted. Now the poem shows a good bit of interest in law but very little in anything which can be interpreted as medicine. Personal hygiene, for instance, is largely limited to keeping oneself in a condition which will not be offensive to social superiors. Indeed — and Professor Thorndike will be disappointed here — nothing is said about total bathing. In short there is the possibility that Grosseteste did study something a little like medicine between the date of this treatise and his stay with the bishop of Hereford. This should have been in the middle of the 1190s, when Bardney says Grosseteste studied at Cambridge. The possibility of elementary medicine is interesting because through medicine much Arabic knowledge came west.[50] The poem then may well have been written just after Grosseteste finished his study at Lincoln and his service with the bishop of Lincoln.

Several lines indicate that the audience is English: [51]

Be careful about shouting "Wassail" unless it is requested
If someone says "Wassail" let your response be "Drinkheil."

[49] R. W. Hunt, "English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century," Trans. Royal Hist. Soc., 4th series, XIX (1936), 21.

[50] A. Birkenmajer, "Le rôle joué par les médicins et les naturalistes dans la réception d'Aristote au XII-e et XIII-e siècles," Pologne au VI-e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Oslo, 1928 (Warsaw, 1930), pp. 1–15.

[51] Lines 70 and 182 respectively. Altitonare cave Wesheyl nisi precipiatur.
Si dicate Wesheyl responsio sit tua drincheyl !

Even more the lines about the duties of a clerk indicate England: [52]

> Provident and prudent in all things be a discreet clerk: you write writs, charters, receipts and lists of expenses: you record reliefs, debts, *gersumas*, fines, scutages and taxes; you likewise count out good money. Do not reduce expenses which produce honor.

This statement of the duties as a clerk, so detailed and clear, may have been rooted in his own experience as a clerk of the bishop of Lincoln. In addition to these duties the clerk is expected to serve in the chapel and even to preach to the household.

The treatise is designed to be a study of etiquette of the curia; from its first line apparently the royal court. Yet the scene is of the court of a noble or even a wealthy knight rather than that of a king. A royal clerk could hardly be expected to tend to all of the duties outlined above for him: preaching, holding religious services, and keeping accounts. One of the more earthy parts of the poem is of the etiquette of the latrine.[53] Its facilities were apparently limited to only a few top ranking persons: the others were expected to hit for the woods and the fields, something much more appropriate for a country manor than for London or Winchester. It is thus very doubtful if Grosseteste was writing at the English court: indeed there was no good time for him to have done so since it was written during the reign of the great absentee, Richard the Lion Hearted. The treatise does give a good picture of the attitudes and actions expected of the members of such a court, of precedence, of proper deportment, and of genteel habits. It should be worth publication as a picture of the manners of the time.

A bit of personal feeling may appear in two lines in which Grosseteste adjures the poor boy who has become rich to re-

[52] Lines 244–9 Providus et prudens in cunctis esto notator
discretus brevia cartas formare recepta
expensas rerum dicas; terras relavatas
debita gersumas fines scutagia missa
inbreviare; bonam simul et numerare monetam.
Expensas non diminuas que sunt ad honores.
DuCange indicates that *gersuma* and scutage are primarily English.

[53] Lines 192–208.

member the poor as he thinks of his more fortunate present.[54] Here he employs a Virgilian touch.[55] The writer came from the lowest ranks of English society but he was no rebel to contemporary social standards. In fact he appears as a rather unquestioning believer in conventional attitudes, presenting urbanity as the most desirable attitude. The fear of being considered rustic runs through many lines.[56]

In later years, as we have seen, Grosseteste was known as a translator and as a great scientist. Neither interest is evident from the poem. Grosseteste's vocabulary is quite classical with many unusual words: a classical scholar might note other references to the Classics than the one mentioned above. Of science there are no instances apparent but one would hardly expect to find much of it in a treatise such as this one. The most that can be said is that he already possessed a wide vocabulary and a fondness for unusual words.[57]

The localization of this poem in the early period of Grosseteste's life, before 1199, suggests that certain other compositions which might have had feudal patrons in mind may come from the same period. The consistent literary production of Grosseteste indeed encourages one to try to discover works of this early period. Now several pieces for which dates are very uncertain are such Anglo-Norman pieces as the Chasteau d'Amour, Le Mariage des Neuf Filles du Diable and the Peines de Purgatoire. The manuscripts of some of these are numerous, and most of them remain in England: the locale of their composition should be England rather than the continent then.[58]

In any case the long poem on court etiquette gives a rather interesting picture of Grosseteste as a young man. He was obviously ambitious for advancement within the church by conventional tactics and conformity to standard beliefs. He seems to have had no special interest in science then or in language

[54] Lines 401–3 Si pauper puer es, si dives quando senescis
dives preterite memo esto pauperiei
et te preterita memorasse forte iuvant.

[55] Forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit. Virg. A i 203.

[56] Lines 148, 157, 212, 313, 144, among others.

[57] In 1.61 he uses "artocopus" for "baked" apparently: it meant baker. Such words as 'herus' and 'vernula' appear very infrequently in the Middle Ages.

[58] On another suggested date see Thomson, Writings, p. 153.

from a philological standpoint. Indeed from a theological standpoint he was probably a conservative; emphasizing the discipline of Biblical morals rather than the subtlety of scholastic disputation. Dazzled to some extent by association with people of greater social distinction and conforming to their code of civility he nevertheless retained his intellectual integrity. A clerk should preach about the shortcomings of the court, he said, but he should do it courteously. At the end of his life he was still the courteous clerk.[59]

Grosseteste then was a long way from the heights of intellectual and spiritual achievement manifested in his later life. The phases are fairly clear but the road by which he went is not well marked. The evidence of the influence of William de Monte leads one to hope that the influence of other intellectual leaders can be isolated also, although the great originality of the man may make this difficult to accomplish very successfully. The first stage was evidently the acquisition of a zeal for science; did it come from Cambridge or Hereford or Oxford and from Daniel of Merlai or Roger of Hereford or Alexander Nequam? The second stage was apparently the development of an intense religious enthusiasm. Did it derive from Grosseteste's theological training or from the example of the new mendicant orders? These are some of the questions, among many others, which should be answered before the career of this great scholar stands out against the background of the era of scholasticism.

[59] Complimented by the Earl of Gloucester. Cf. Thomson, Writings, p. 148.

APPENDIX

Table I

Location of Grosseteste's Manuscripts of Works Written after 1235

Number	Title	England XIII Cent.	England Later	Continent XIII Cent.	Continent Later
1	Testamenta XII Patriarcharum (Translations)	13	18	2	44
2	Opera Johannis Damasceni Nos. 1–13				
	(i) De Logica	7	2	3	1
	(ii) De Centum Heresibus	2	2	2	..
	(iii) De Fide Orthodoxa	6	..	4	1
	(iv) Elementarium Dogmatum	5	1	3	..
	(v) De Hymno Trisagion	4	1	1	.
3	Prologus Maximi Confessoris in Opera Pseudo-Dionysii				
4	Scholia Maximi Confessoris				
5	Opera Pseudo-Dionysii				
	(i) De Celesti Hierarchia	3	1	5	8
	(ii) De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia	3	1	4	3
	(iii) De Divinis Nominibus	2	1	5	3
	(iv) De Mystica Theologia	1	2	4	11
6	Epistole Ignacii Martiris et Beate Virginis	..	11	6	35
7	Lexicon Suida				
8	Suidas on Iesous	5	6	..	1
9	Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea				
10	Aristoteles De Celo et Mundo				
11	Aristotelis De Lineis Indivisibilibus				
12	Aristotelis De Virtute	1	..	1	3
13	Commentatores Greci in Ethica Nicomachea Aristotelis	5	..	8	8
20	Commentarii in Opera Pseudo-Dionysii				
21	Notule in Opera Pseudo-Dionysii				
22	Notula super Epistolam Johannis Damasceni de Trisagion	1	4	..	..

23	Prologus in Librum Damasceni de Logica	3	1	. .	. .
28	Notule in Ethica Nicomachea, etc.				
43	Compotus Minor	1	. .	. .	. .
49	Hexameron	1	4	. .	1
50	Grammatica	1	1	. .	1
76	Ars Predicandi	1	. .	. .	. .
78	Concordancia Patrum	. .	. .	1	. .
81	De Confessione III	1	1	. .	. .
82	De Confessione et Modo Confitendi Peccata	1	. .	. .	. .
85	Correctorium Tocius Biblie	3	2	. .	. .
86	De Cura Pastorali	. .	3	. .	. .
87	Dialogus de Contemptu Mundi	1	. .	. .	. .
94	De Humilitate Contemplativorum	1	. .	. .	. .
95	Meditaciones	. .	2	. .	. .
98	Ordinacio de Pecunia Deposita in Cista S. Frideswyde	. .	3	. .	. .
100	De Penis Purgatorii	. .	7	. .	. .
102	De Sanguine Christi	1	. .	. .	. .
103	Templum Domini	24	17	9	15
104	De Triplici Rectitudine	1	. .	. .	. .
105	De Tyrannide				
106	Versus de X Mandatis	1	. .	. .	. .
110	Regule ad Custodiendum Terras	1	. .	. .	. .
112	Statuta Familie	1	. .	. .	. .
120	Les Reulles Seint Robert	2	4	. .	. .

TABLE II

Location of Manuscripts of Grosseteste's Works Written about 1225–35

Number	Title	England XIII Cent.	England Later	Continent XIII Cent.	Continent Later
16	Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Galathas	..	1	..	..
17	Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos	1	..	..	..
18	Commentarius in Psalmos 1-C	2	1	..	1
19	Notule in Psalterium	2	..	..	..
74	De Veritate	1	3	..	4
75	De Veritate Proposicionis	..	2	..	7
77	De Cessacione Legalium	1	15		1
83	De Modo Confitendi	2	3	..	..
91	De X Mandatis	..	21	..	2
96	Moralitates super Evangelia	2	2	..	.
	Parts of Summa, possibly written earlier at Paris				
34	De Libero Arbitrio I	..	1	1	1
35	De Libero Arbitrio II	..	3	..	..
63	De Ordine Emanandi Causatorum a Deo	..	2	..	3
67	V Questiones Theologice	..	1	..	..
68	De Scientia Dei I	..	2	..	3
88	De Dotibus	..	2	..	..
89	De Eucharista	..	1	..	..

TABLE III

Location of Manuscripts of Grosseteste's Works Written before 1225

A. Predominance of Continental Manuscripts

Number	Title	England		Continent	
		XIII Cent.	Later	XIII Cent.	Later
26	Summa in VIII Libros Physicorum Aristotelis	..	2	..	6
27	Commentarius in Libros Analyticorum Posteriorum Aristotelis	2	5	5	13
30	Regule Libri Priorum Analyticorum Aristotelis	..	..	..	1
31	Summa in Ethica Nicomachea	3	..	3	5
32	De Accessu et Recessu Maris	..	..	2	2
36	De Artibus Liberalibus	..	..	..	5
37	De Calore Questio	..	..	1	..
38	De Calore Solis	..	..	1	4
40	De Cometis et Causis Ipsarum	..	..	1	2
42	Compotus Correctorius	9	8	10	2
44	De Differenciis Localibus	..	3	..	4
45	De Finitate Motus et Temporis	..	1	..	4
46	De Forma Prima Omnium	..	8	1	8
47	De Generacione Sonorum	..	1	..	6
48	De Generacione Stellarum	..	..	..	4
51	Quod homo sit minor Mundus	..	4	..	5
53	De Impressionibus Elementorum	..	3	..	4
54	De Intelligenciis	..	8	1	8
55	De Iride	1	6	2	3
56	Kalendarium	6	1	10	6
57	De Lineis, Angulis et Figuris	1	1	3	7
58	De Luce	..	7	1	5
59	De Motu Corporali et Luce	..	2	..	4
60	De Motu Supercelestium	..	2	..	4
61	De Natura Locorum	1	..	1	6
62	De Operacionibus Solis	..	..	1	..
65	Ptolomeus de Novem Planetis	..	..	..	3
69	De Sphera	8	14	9	7
71	De Subsistencia Rei	..	..	1	..
114	Confessioun	..	..	..	1

TABLE IV

Location of Manuscripts of Grosseteste's Works Written before 1225
B. Predominance of English Manuscripts

Number	*Title*	*England* XIII Cent.	*England* Later	*Continent* XIII Cent.	*Continent* Later
24	Commentarius in Sophisticos Elenchos Aristotelis	..	1	..	..
25	Commentarius in VIII Libros Physicorum Aristotelis	..	2	..	1
29	Questiones in De Celo et Mundo Aristotelis	1	..	..	..
33	De Anima	1	..	..	..
39	De Colore	1	5	1	4
41	Compotus I	1	..	..	..
52	De Impressionibus Aeris	2	11	2	2
64	De Potencia et Actu	..	3	..	..
66	De Quadratura Circuli	3	1	2	2
70	De Statu Causarum	..	5	..	4
73	De Universitatis Machina	2	..	..	..
97	De Obsequiis Bene Dicendis	1	..	..	..
101	De Penitencia David	1	..	..	..
109	Liber Curialis	1	..	..	..
111	Stans Puer ad Mensam	1	5	..	..
113	Chasteau d'Amour	7	6	2	1
116	Le Mariage des Neuf Filles du Diable	1	1	..	..
117	Oracio ad Sanctam Margaretam Gallica	1	..	..	..
119	Peines de Purgatoire	2	4	..	..

BOOKS RECEIVED

Die Anfänge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis. *Von Arthur Rich.* Zürich, Zwingli-Verlag [1949] 180 p. (no price)

Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. *By George Haddad.* [N. Y., Hafner Publishing Company, Distributors.] 196 p. $2.50.

The Bible and Modern Belief. A constructive approach to the present religious upheaval. *By Louis Wallis.* Durham, Duke University Press [1949] 176 p. $2.50.

The Christian Demand for Social Justice. *Edited by William Scarlett.* [N. Y.] New American Library, 1949. 126 p. (no price)

Erziehung und Seelsorge. *Von Carl Günther.* Zürich, Zwingli-Verlag [1949] 180 p. (no price)

Étienne Gilson. Philosophe de la Chrétienté. *Par J. Maritain et des autres.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf. 295 p. 150 fr.

Les Homelies Catechetiques de Theodore de Mopsueste. Traduction, introduction, index *par Raymond Tonneau* . . . Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949. 623 p. (no price)

L'Homme de Sartre. *Par Benoit Pruche.* [Vichy] Arthaud [1949] 129 p. (no price)

Jaques Maritain. Son Oeuvre Philosophique. [*Par Etienne Gilson et des autres*] Paris, Bibliotheque de la Revue Thomiste, Desclé de Brouwer, Editerus. (no date, no price)

La Nature de la Théologie d'après Melchior Cano. *Par Eugène Marcotte.* Ottawa, Editions de l'Université, 1949. 217 p. $3.00.

The Philosophy of Personalism. A study in the metaphysics of religion. *By Albert C. Knudson.* Boston, Boston University Press, 1949. 438 p. $2.75.

Rethinking the Unitarian Relationship with Protestantism. *By George H. Williams.* Boston, The Beacon Press, 1949. 42 p. $.50. (Paper)

Sonntagsgesetzgebung. Ein Ueberblick bis in die Gegenwart. *Von Helene Stokar.* Zürich, Zwingli-Verlag [1949] 117 p. (no price)

The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. *By Aubrey R. Johnson.* Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1949. 107 p. 6/–

Das Zinsproblem. Eine historische Utersuchung. *Von Ernst Ramp.* Zürich, Zwingli-Verlag [1949] 121 p. (no price)